

HUMPHREY TV PROGRAM WITH BROOM AND SUMNER

FEBRUARY 8, 1963

STP + Dub papers
Min. area
Sunday TV.

INTRODUCTION: (The first part of Intro. was cut off ... its outstanding Government leaders on this program for the Minnesota area. Today, however, Senator Humphrey will be on the other side of the interview answering questions by two Washington newspaper men. Now first, here is Senator Humphrey.

HUMPHREY: Well thank you. I'm very pleased to welcome to this program two of Washington's outstanding correspondants and two who are well-known to Minnesota audiences. Mr. William Broom and Mr. William Sumner. Mr. Broom, Mr. Sumner. Now these gentlemen cover the news of Washington for the nation-wide Ritter publications. Their by-lines, as I said, are very familiar to us out home in the St. Paul Pioneer Press, and up in Duluth, in the Duluth News Tribune and Herald, and I should say the St. Paul Dispatch, as well, so I'm going to take a big risk today---I'm going to put myself in their tender hands and let them ask whatever questions they might want to in the hopes that I might be able to at least give an intelligent response. This is a totally un-rehearsed program, so I think I'll just turn to you first, Mr. Broom, and let you ask question number 1.

BROOM: Senator, several commentators including yourself have indicated that the Administration could have avoided some of the controversy over Cuba during recent weeks had it spoken out with a little more candor. Are you satisfied now that the American people have all the facts that they

need?

HUMPHREY: It is my view that the squabble and confusion here over the Cuba issue was revived when the story came out about the Bay of Pigs operation, when the Attorney General indicated that there had never been any commitment of air cover. This threw everything right back into the headlines and it became a partisan matter. I have felt that the Cuban issue has been dealt with a bit irresponsibly by some of the critics and I've said a number of times that there was a lack of frankness and candor in the earlier weeks here from the Administration. Because of this, I spoke out and urged public hearings, for example, rather than these executive secret sessions. I urged that the Administration tell the American people all of the facts insofar as we have those facts. I'm happy to say that's what the President has done. That's what the Secretary of Defense did, I thought admirably, Robert McNamara in this splendid presentation of some days ago. Now this is what the Director of Central Intelligence, Mr. McCone has done. Yes, I believe that we now have the facts, I say, insofar as we can ascertain the facts. Now there is, obviously, some risk involved here. We can't be sure of all developments in Cuba. We are not in Cuba. Nevertheless, we have a good intelligence system. We have a good flow of information, a constant flow of information from Cuba, and as you know, we've been taking aerial photographs of the Cuban military installations, of their highways, of their ports, and we've been doing this daily. So I would say that the people have been pretty well informed now about Cuba. But again, as I want to repeat, there may be some things there that we do not know, but the Administration is not keeping anything back.

SUMNER: Well, Senator, would you say on this same line, that this is an example of say bad news management. For instance, if the American public had been given this information over a period of weeks of since the crisis itself, thus obviating the need for this "over-kill" by McNamara the other day, do you think that would lessen the partisan approach to this Cuba matter?

HUMPHREY: I believe that the President thought that the information was being given to the people, and he, of course, in his own press conferences stated quite candidly several weeks ago that he knew what the situation to be in Cuba. But let's be very frank about it. A certain number of our friends on the other side of the isle decided to make this quite an issue--- Mr. Keating was back at it, Senator Dirkson was back at it. It made headlines. There were all such charges made and I thought the mistake that was being made was the fact that the Administration didn't respond to these charges soon enough. I thought that they ought to have been nailed, as we say, right now. The President was of the opinion that this was unnecessary. Now we've involved ourselves without exposing our intelligence system. When Mr. McNamara went to all the trouble of giving the American people this information, he obviously weakened the whole intelligence system to answer the partisan critics. I would hope that the people would keep in mind that 17,000 troops in Cuba are hardly any match for the 1,500,000 troops that we have in the United States. Nevertheless, the main danger of Cuba is the subversion base, the propaganda base that it means to the Western Hemisphere. So the problem in Cuba is not merely military. In fact, it is maybe less military than otherwise. It's a problem of political penetration, a problem of subversion, a problem of uneasiness throughout the whole

Western Hemisphere, particularly in the Caribbean area. And what I think we ought to do, and what I said is it will do us no good to rake over old coals. It doesn't do us any good to go back and try to find out why did Fidel come to power, was this Eisenhower's fault, was the Bay of Pigs Kennedy's fault. He said he took full responsibility for it. What I think is more important is where do we go from here. What do we plan for tomorrow. What about Haiti? What about the Dominican Republic? What about Panama? What about the threats that come to all the Caribbean nations? What is our plan for Cuba if Cuba could be liberated. What do we have to offer. What kind of a political program are we going to pose for these people? You can't go back to Batista. If that's all you have to offer the Cubans will most likely stay with Fidel. So you've got to go out in front, it seems to me, with a program of progressive reform and a counter attack program of guerilla tactics of inside penetration of Cuba, of subversion within Cuba. And I've talked to people who have some pretty good ideas about that.

BROOM: Senator, I wonder if we might turn now to a subject I know would interest a lot of people out in Minnesota. As you are aware, Britain's bid for entering into the Common Market was turned down rather summarily recently. A lot of people think this may result in a new protectionism in Western Europe. And a lot of other people have surmised that it may be that the American farmer may have to bear the brunt of that particular protectionism, and this is pretty serious because Western Europe is the farmer's biggest market.

HUMPHREY: Yes, this is very, very serious. The entire development about the Common Market in recent months, recent weeks, has been very serious in

many ways. First of all it has shaken the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance. It surely has caused great difficulties. The conflict between DeGaul in France and McMillian in Great Britain caused great difficulties among the six partners of the Common Market. France today has taken a very stern position of refusal of permitting Great Britain to come in. Now, what does this mean to us. Well I think it means several things. First of all, as I said, the uneasiness politically in the Alliance, I believe, makes it more difficult for us to realize what we call the Atlantic Community, which is a major political development if it can be brought about. A political development of strength politically, economically, and militarily. To our farm people, the Common Market is offering some serious problems because what you have in the Common Market today as far as Agriculture is concerned, the lowering of barriers within the Market so that you've got a free flow of goods between Italy and France and Germany, for example, lifting the barriers, is raising the barriers on the outside. We've seen this about our poultry industry, for example. Broilers going into Germany. We've lost a vast amount of export business here. Now what we are going to have to do, it seems to me, is to insist through our negotiations, that fair treatment be given to our commodities and we may have to take some retaliation, I hope not, but I think that we have to let the French, and the Germans, and others know that if they're not going to play fair by us, since we're a large importer of their commodities, we import millions of dollars from these countries, millions of dollars of goods, then we may have to take another look. But more importantly, I believe there are other markets to develop. In Japan, for example, in South America, in the outer

*File
do sent to Dwight
Murdall*

EXCERPT FROM

TV FILM TO BE
RELEASED SUNDAY NIGHT +
MONDAY A.M. PAPERS.

-6-

seven of Europe. That's the Scandanavian countries, and Great Britain and others, that's what they call the European Free Trade Area, the EFTA group. There are seven countries there as compared with the six in the Common Market. Let's develop these markets more. Let's give some trade privileges to some of our friends in the outer seven and at the same time keep trying hard to develop markets in the Common Market. I think that this is just an adjustment period, Bill. I really mean that in a short period of time the Common Market will do exactly what we said it will do, it will improve economic and trade relationships within and without the Market, and what we need to do is bury down now trying to find new markets in other parts of the world as we seek to penetrate the Common Market.

SUMNER: Senator, getting on to a subject that seems to be very warm now in Minnesota---

HUMPHREY: I'm glad it's warm now in Minnesota---

SUMNER: ---In spite of the temperature, how do you view the compromise the Steel Worker's Union has made with the companies in regard to a taconite amendment?

HUMPHREY: Well, I felt that whatever we could do to bring about taconite development, the investment ~~of~~ a taconite plant in Minnesota, is all to the good. It has been my suggestion and my hope that we wouldn't just wait for a Constitutional amendment because that would take some time no matter how much support it has. It is very difficult to amend our state constitution even though I have a feeling that this amendment might succeed. But in the

meantime, I would hope that the Legislature of Minnesota would pass the Taconite statute that would do very much the same thing as a taconite Constitutional amendment. And if the amendment come on later on, if that's the will of the people of the state, then the statute would not be necessary, but I don't want to leave anything untried that would bring out the possibility of new investment in taconite in Minnesota. This is a great new frontier out there for us, and we need to encourage it in every possible way. And I appeal on this television broadcast, as I've done privately to the steel companies, to make your investment in Minnesota. It pays off. There are steel companies, reserved mining, and area mining there in Minnesota. They're doing well. And the big steel company up in Minnesota is U.S. Steel, Oliver Mining. And I hope that they'll make a great investment in our state. They really owe it to Minnesota to do so, and beside that, I think that they'll do quite well economically.

BROOM: Senator, as we talk to a lot of Senators and Congressmen, like yourself, around here, we find they aren't getting much mail from the grass routes asking for a tax cut or supporting the President's request for a tax cut. Do you think this may slow down consideration and eventual passage of a tax cut bill this year?

HUMPHREY: No, I don't. You have to expect that the mail that comes in now will be primarily mail that is critical of the President's tax program. Everybody more or less assumes that they're going to get the tax cut, but what they're worried about is what kind of reforms are going to be tacked on to the tax cut. And so what we're getting now is a flow of mail against

certain suggested reforms. I feel that it is very important that this tax cut be made and as I've told you privately and for your newspapers, I believe it needs to be made quickly because the real impact of the tax cut will be whether or not it's large enough. It will be based on whether it's large enough and soon enough. And if it isn't large enough it's not going to help our economy, and if it isn't soon enough it's going to be too late. So let's get on with it, and I hope that we can have some tax reform with it. In fact, I think that many of the reforms are good, but I do not want to delay the tax cut just on the basis that you've got to get all the reforms I spoke about, quite frankly about it to the Administration and the Congress.

SUMNER: Well, is the Administration giving up on its demands for a tax reform?

HUMPHREY: No, No, nor am I. But I'm a realist and what I find in Congress is that you may have a mark towards which you point and shoot. Sometimes you don't quite make that. All that Senator Humphrey is saying is that the major issue is the tax cut itself cause the purpose of the tax message was to bring the capital into the private market, and that's what you get out of a tax cut. Now I think the reforms are helpful, I think they're mandatory. Therefore, I feel that let's try to put the best package together we can, but let's not delay so long that it won't be effective. I'm afraid that we're going to have to call this show to a halt, Gentlemen. By the way I want to thank you both very much for appearing, and I want to assure the people of Minnesota that we have here two of the outstanding reporters of the Nation's Capital and I want to bring them back to this show once again. Now two weeks from now we'll be with you, and until then, so long.

ANNOUNCER: This has been Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota who was interviewed today by reporters William Broom and William Sumner, of the Ritter Publications.

(END)



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org