

Remarks of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey  
at the Denver Airport  
Denver, Colorado  
September 12, 1964

Senator Humphrey. Thank you very much, my good, non-partisan, pro-Democratic, LBJ Mayor of Denver.

First of all, Mr. Mayor, I want to express my thanks to this wonderful band that is here to greet us and this color guard. This is very thoughtful of you and it is very impressive and deeply appreciated.

Secondly, I want to salute my colleagues in the Congress of the United States, Congressman Rogers, Congressman, Aspinall, and also these new ones we are going to have, Roy McVickers, here, and Frank Evans.

Then I want to pay my respects to a dear old friend, with whom I was privileged to serve and who served with such distinction, your own former Senator and still one of the greatest citizens of the west, Senator Ed Johnson.

There are just so many people here that I could mention that we could spend a whole afternoon out here at the airport just reminisceng. But lest we forget for a moment, let me say I once lived in Denver and I like Denver and I like Colorado and I like the Democrats out here.

I also want to mention that a dear friend of mine was here to welcome me when I came in the airplane. I have known him for years, and I miss him in Washington and I am sorry he is not here. That is that old good fighter, the man for progressive democracy, John E. Carroll.

You know, I used to complain about the fact that we needed a new Secretary of Agriculture. That is back in the days of Benson -- I shouldn't have mentioned that name. But I was glad to see today a friend of the farmer, a great former Secretary of Agriculture, Charley Brannan, here along with my old friend, Jim Patton, of the Barbers Union.

Then let me say to our friends in the labor movement, Mr. Roth, Harry Roth, and to Mr. Knight, Mr. Brown, and a host of the others, how grateful I am for this reception.

Now, friends, look here. You have done some good work on these signs and I want to congratulate the artists, the artists of the west who have made all these signs for LBJ

and HHH. Just keep them high all during this campaign.

And I noticed when I got off the plane that there were a number of people here who came up to me and said Buena suerte, which means good luck, Hubert. I wish to raise my voice today and salute my good friends here, the Spanish-speaking Americans who are out here to help the Democratic Party go on to victory, on November 3rd.

Well, friends, we are involved now in a big campaign, a campaign that is going to either mean that we continue the program of progress and prosperity which this country presently has, or it can end up in a situation where America literally retreats.

But I was at Rapid City just a few moments ago. The mayor of that city, Mayor Currihan, said that he heard occasionally in Washington that people in Washington were capable of driving rather fast. I guess that was a reference to that man from Texas. And I said then and I want to repeat it here now, I think America has a choice of whether it wants a man in the driver's seat who has his foot on the throttle and the gas feed, or a man who has his foot on the break and slips the car in reverse. That is your choice.

You know, we also have a unique situation that is developing in America. We have people today who are not just Democrats who are going to vote the Democratic ticket. We have literally thousands, yes, millions of people, who for many years have considered themselves as Republicans. But this time, yes, sir, but this time, that man in going to vote the Democratic ticket for Johnson.

Isn't that so?

Now, you know, my dear friends, most Republicans and most Democrats in Congress, they vote to help the west move ahead with economic progress.

But not Senator Goldwater!

Most Americans, whether they are Democrats or Republicans, voted for equal opportunity for all Americans, regardless of race, color, or creed.

But not Senator Goldwater.

You are with it today, you are with it today, you are doing

fine.

Most Americans thought it was a good idea that we have a tax reduction this year and that those taxes that were reduced and the income from those reductions go to the American people so that the American people could spend, so they could invest, so we can have a bigger and better America.

Yes, most Americans -- Republicans and Democrats alike -- in Congress voted to reduce your taxes. But not Senator Goldwater.

You know the score, all right. You know the score.

Most Americans, my young people, most Senators voted for aid to education, higher education for your colleges. Most Americans did that.

But not Senator Goldwater.

You have the record of no, no, no, a thousand times no, and that kind of record means no go for America, and that means there will be a no vote on November 3 for Senator Goldwater.

Now, my friends, we have some work to do this afternoon. I just want to leave you with this note of caution.

This is going to be a hard-fought campaign and I want every one of you here to take a pledge with me today. I want you to pledge that you are going to work harder than you have ever worked before so that you can be sure, despite the good polls, despite all of the evidence that we have that we are going to have victory on November 3rd, I want you to pledge me now, and I want you to raise those signs high, pledge to me, my friends, that between now and November 3d, you are going to make sure that Lyndon B. Johnson and Hubert Humphrey are elected in that great election.

Thank you, thank you very much.

Remarks of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey  
at Denver Auditorium  
Denver, Colorado  
September 12, 1964

Senator Humphrey. Thank you, thank you very much for a good Democratic welcome. I am very grateful to you.

Ladies and gentlemen, my fellow Democrats, and all of you who are going to be on the victory march between now and November 3, it is mighty, mighty good to be in Colorado. I have had a good time today in your great city and in your great State. I have met many old friends. I have been with my friends in agriculture, our friends in labor, our friends in business, I have been with the folks in every part of your great community. And there is one fact that is very evident -- Lyndon B. Johnson is going to be elected President of the United States in November.

There is something else that is rather evident, too. I find that these two incumbent Congressmen that you have, Congressman Byron Rogers and Congressman Wayne Aspinall, are also going to be back to Washington to help Lyndon Johnson.

And just because they need company and because our President is going to need help, you are going to send to Washington Frank Evans and you are going to send Roy McVicker.

Before I stand before you one minute longer, I want to pay my respects to one of the finest Democrats that the West ever produced, the former Governor of this State, the great Democrat and the great progressive, Steve McNichols. And we Senators always stick together. They say it is the most exclusive club in the world. It is hard to get in, it is a good place to stay, you really never should get out unless you run for Vice President.

But I want to say how good it is to be once again in the company of a senior statesman from the West, your own Ed Johnson, and also that fine United States Senator and that good friend of mine, John Carroll.

I hope that Bob Maytag will forgive me for being so non-partisan all day. I have hardly said a partisan word. All I have said all day is that what is good for America is that you vote the Democratic ticket in November. And I am awfully pleased to come to a city that has a non-partisan Democratic mayor, too.

Let me tell you, I was honored and gratified by the fact that you were willing to take your time to come out there to the airport today to greet me.

So I salute the Democrats of Colorado, and I ask you to get many more of them into our friendly household.

You know, we have been having a great time on this western trip. It started in South Dakota. That is right, there are a few Dakotans here. And I have good news for you, it is going Democratic this year.

And we had sort of a homecoming out in South Dakota. One of the advantages of moving often is that you have a lot of places you can call home. Just two weeks ago, we had a homecoming in Minneapolis. Then we had another homecoming where I presently live in a little town called Waverly. Then yesterday, we had a homecoming in Watertown, South Dakota. Then we had a homecoming in Doland, South Dakota. And then we had a homecoming in Huron, South Dakota. And then we had a real, rip-snorting Democratic rally in Rapid City, South Dakota, this morning.

So now I come to the west. I come to Denver, the great City of the west, of the Rockies. And I know that Denver is going to set the pace; Colorado is going to set the pace for electing a man of the West of the 20th Century and rejecting a man of the West of the 19th Century.

Well, my friends, tonight we are going to talk about pioneering. We are going to have a little visit about discovery. We are going to talk about the America that is ours and the America that can be.

Remarks of  
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey  
at COPE State Convention  
Labor Center,  
Denver, Colorado  
September 12, 1964

Senator Humphrey. Thank you very much, Herrick. Thank you for a rousing reception here.

I want to thank every one of our good friends of the AFL-CIO, of these good, progressive, fine people of Colorado for a reception that I am sure has been heard all the way back to the White House.

I have been to Denver many times, and I can think of no time when everything looked brighter and looked more promising, more optimistic, than at this particular moment. Why even the skies are lit up with the sun in the heaven and it just tells me that this is the kind of day that people ought to be thinking about how they can be sure to get two or three more votes from friends and neighbors, and for LBJ and HHH.

By the way, while you are doing that, don't forget we have a Congress, too, because some people seem to feel that it is just fine, you know, to vote for a Democrat for President and then send a Republican down there to cancel out the work that the President wants to get done. So you just continue now to vote for Byron Rogers and Wayne Aspinall.

And I noticed in looking over the checksheet here that you folks have been politically sinning part of the time, because you have a couple of Republican Congressmen. Now, this can be remedied. It doesn't take too much to do it. And particularly out there in the second district, where you ought to be able to elect Roy McVicker handily.

And after having met Frank Evans this morning, I know you are going to elect him. So get on with your job.

I am not going to name all your local candidates. You know who they are. But when in doubt, vote Democratic, just remember that.

The first thing I want to say to you so that I don't forget it, because I didn't come here with any big, prepared speech, I came here to see friends, and I gather that there are plenty of them here today, the first thing I want to tell you is that despite the fact that the public opinion polls look good, and

they are, and they have never been so good for any Democratic or Republican nominee for President in the history of our country, despite all that, the real goal that is important is that polling booth, that election booth on election day. I want to say to our friends here at COPE and of the AFL-CIO that you see to it that you get everybody registered. You see to it on election day that you get all your friends and neighbors and relatives, and even folks that you may not know as friends, see that you get them there to the electionbox to vote and if you get them there, we will trust their judgment.

And I think they are going to vote Democratic, don't you?

Somebody told me that we have to worry about political apathy. I don't think it is political apathy we need to worry about. What we need to worry about is if that gentleman from Arizona should, by some way or manner, get into that White House.

And I suggest to you that since he loves his home State so much, you give him the privilege of remaining there for the next four years.

Well, now, why should you do that?

Well, as I said a little while ago, since we are now entering on the football season, when you have a team that is going down the field and scoring touchdowns like this Democratic team, for goodness sakes, don't take them out and put in a lot of substitutes. And when you have a quarterback who knows how to call the signals and how to make those touchdowns and how to run straight toward the goal line, don't put a fellow in that gets the signals loused up and runs backwards.

In other words, what we need between now and election is some mighty good, clean, hard, down field blocking to clear the way. And then what we need to do is to keep that man who knows how to govern this Nation, how to give this Nation leadership, to keep him right on the job in the White House and make sure that he is going to have four more years there to work for you and to work for me, to work for America and to work for a free world.

And that man is Lyndon B. Johnson.

I was out in South Dakota yesterday. Oh, we had a great

time. I was in my old home town, the county where I was born, the town where I went to grade school and high school. I was in Huron, South Dakota, where my brother and my mother live, and where Humphrey's Drug Store is -- I always get a commercial in, you know. If you ever drive through, stop in. And we had a wonderful time.

Last night I spoke to a fine audience in our local hometown arena, and I spoke primarily to farm people, because that is a great agricultural area. And I recited there some of the words of the temporary spokesman of the Goldwater faction of the Republican Party.

I said according to Mr. Goldwater -- this is what he said -- "I don't know anything about farming." And I took him at his words and so did the farmers.

But I think you ought to beware. This fellow does claim to be some sort of an expert on labor. But what an expert. He would like nothing better than to see the so-called mis-named right-to-work laws enacted in every State and every union member knows what this would mean to his union, to his job security, and to his organization. And you are not going to let that happen, are you?

Now, my good friends, I thought we had arrived at a time in this country when most everybody agreed on a few things. As I recall, in the Congress of the United States, most everyone, including Republicans and Democrats alike, believes in, strongly supports and promotes, the extension of Social Security, but not Senator Goldwater.

You really got the message all right.

I don't think we ought to be too critical, however. I will tell you why. Mr. Goldwater is coming close to being for Social Security. Somebody said that he wasn't in the mainstream of Republicanism. Listen, he hasn't even come close to the shoreline yet, never mind the mainstream. But he has now indicated -- of course, it could change -- that he believes that if he were elected President, which is only a theoretical exercise, may I say -- if he were, that he could still support some form of Social Security. Now, it has taken him 28 years to arrive at that position, but for this, I want to express a note of gratitude.

I thought that most everybody in America, business and labor,

Congressmen and Senators, Republicans and Democrats alike, were for minimum wages and at least \$1.25 an hour minimum wage.

But not Senator Goldwater.

As an old teacher, I want to say you are doing well on this message.

Then, as you know, this past year, after better than one year of study and one year of very careful examination of the revenue needs of our country and what was needed to stimulate this economy, to fulfill that promise that John Kennedy gave us to get this country moving again, as you know, after a year of study, and as my friends in the House know, after a year of hearings in the House Ways and Means Committee, the Congress of the United States, most Democrats and most Republicans, agreed and passed this massive tax cut that released \$11.5 billion of capital for American business and American labor and American farmers and American consumers to spend.

But not Senator Goldwater.

Right. Go to the head of your class.

This seems to be repeated, regrettably, time after time. And I intend to repeat it, because I think the people of America ought to know it. The Democratic Administration found a country in 1961 with an economy that was stagnant, with unemployment rising, with our gold reserves fading, with young people walking the streets, with school dropouts increasing, with serious problems in many areas of this great land of ours. And we set to work to do something about it. And we passed in the Congress of the United States, for example, an area redevelopment program to put to work the Federal Government and the State government and labor and capital and business and unions, to put them together to work to build jobs, to put new industries up, to make America a better place.

And I am happy to say that on final passage, we had an overwhelming vote for that bill.

But there, again, not Senator Goldwater.

And the same was true of accelerated public works. And there isn't a single person that doesn't know that there is a great need in America for better public facilities, for sewage

disposal plants, for hospitals, for court houses, for roads, for streets, for a host of things to give people work when they want to work.

Americans want to work. Americans want good jobs. Americans want to build America so the Congress of the United States, under the leadership of John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson, brought to us a program of public works for communities where there were unemployed, where there were needs to be fulfilled. And the Democratic Administration passed that bill.

But not with the help of Senator Goldwater. Not a bit.

Then, my friends, housing, urban renewal -- I come through your beautiful city of Denver. I go to my own lovely and wonderful city of Minneapolis, and I see block after block that has been cleaned out of slums and old buildings under urban renewal. I see homes that have been constructed, public housing for low income groups. These are programs that have been fashioned by Democratic administrations, and I am happy to say again, my dear friends, in most instances, most members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike, voted for the great national housing program presented to the Congress by Presidents Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson.

But not Senator Goldwater.

That is the refrain, time after time, no, no, no, against, against, against. Then he wants to lead the Nation. Where? Back? Far back. And we are not about ready to let him have it.

The same thing was true in higher education which means so much to this great organization of labor. We are going to have to build more classrooms. We ought to have as the theme for every American -- opportunity. Give our young people a chance, equip them with better education, make our universities and our high schools and our secondary schools, make our great schools of technology and vocational schools, make them the best in the world. That is what this Administration has been trying to do and we did it. And we put the money on the line. We passed the legislation, and I am happy to say that a majority of the Congress voted for it.

But not Senator Goldwater.

And it goes down the line. And everything we can think of.

I don't want to keep you much longer.

But even on the great issues, on the most fundamental issues of our time, of slowing down this nuclear arms race, of keeping the atmosphere that we breathe clean from radioactive pollution, of seeing to it that a little child can drink a glass of milk without it being filled with Strontium 90, of seeing to it that somehow sanity can be brought amongst the affairs of men in this world, a great President and a Vice President and a Secretary of State negotiated a tremendous accomplishment in the field of foreign policy. We negotiated and we ratified the nuclear test ban treaty. And I am happy to say here that over three -- yes, better than that, four-fifths of the members of the United States Senate voted for sanity, voted for decency, voted for clean air, voted for wholesome milk, voted to slow down the nuclear arms race.

But not Senator Goldwater. That is the most serious issue of all.

Then it came to the matter of where we stand on citizenship in this country. And let me tell you that the issue of civil rights is not a partisan issue. It never was and it never should have been.

A great Republican by the name of Abraham Lincoln was the author of the Emancipation Proclamation. He gave the promise of freedom and it was for this administration and for our generation to make that promise a reality. We have only one Constitution. There is only one kind of citizenship and that is American citizenship. And if there is anything that this America of ours is dedicated to, it is to human dignity, it is to human equality, it is to equal opportunity.

And the civil rights bill before the Congress was a moral necessity. It was a moral issue. It was a national issue. And that moral issue had to be met. And that national issue had to be resolved.

And you know and I know that an overwhelming majority of the members of the House of Representatives, Republicans and Democrats alike, 152 Democrats, 138 Republicans, voted for the civil rights bill.

And the same thing was true in the United States Senate, where even the Republican Minority Leader was one of the

architects of the civil rights bill.

There it was. There was the opportunity for America to vote to show clean hands to the world and say that we welcome people because they are people, that we respect human dignity, that we believe in humanity, that we are going to erase from America if we possibly can, this smear, this smirch and this blight of discrimination and intolerance and bigotry. And we put the issue, and I am happy to tell you that an overwhelming majority voted for it.

But not Senator Goldwater.

Those are the great issues. And I don't want to cheapen those issues, either, by a refrain. But I ask my friends in the labor movement now to roll up your sleeves and go to work. I ask you to remember that this is a different election than any you have ever had before. There are forces at work in this country today that if they get their way will change America. And we are not about ready to let it happen. We built a great America, an America dedicated to social progress, an America dedicated to opportunity for the young, to compassion for the afflicted, to dignity for the elderly, an America that believes that government and people can work together as friends and partners and not be considered as enemies. That is the kind of America, my friends, that Lyndon B. Johnson wants and that is the kind that he hopes to keep and that is the kind that he hopes to build.

And I am on this ticket for one purpose: to bring the message to America of the promise of America, of the achievements thus far. And I am here to ask you to work as you have never worked before in your lives to make sure that these forces of bitterness, of division, of disunity, yes, these forces that would lead the American people backwards, that those forces are repudiated and that those who believe in a future and in a better America are elected, and that means the election of Lyndon B. Johnson as President.

Remarks of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey  
At the Denver Hilton Hotel  
4:05 p.m., Saturday, September 12, 1964

Senator Humphrey. I don't want to keep you waiting. I know you all have things to do. I should like to open this conference by just saying hello and telling you how much I have enjoyed this very beautiful day in Denver.

From there on out, why don't you start asking your questions?

Question. Senator, one of the things you have been called by Senator Goldwater is the most radical member of the United States Senate -- the most liberal, excuse me. Do you consider that a politically disadvantageous description?

Senator Humphrey. Well, I hope that I am a progressive and thoughtful man in the United States Senate and out of the Senate. To be called a liberal is surely not a word of derogation. I would think it would be a word of compliment.

Woodrow Wilson was a great American liberal. Abraham Lincoln was a great liberal. George Norris and a few others -- Franklin Delano Roosevelt. And I consider it a compliment to be known as a responsible American liberal.

Question. Senator, Congressman Miller, in his opening blast in the campaign, referred to your membership in the ADA. Your reply didn't say anything about the issue on that point. Do you subscribe to the thoughts of ADA unequivocally?

Senator Humphrey. I ascribe to the Democratic platform and to my record in the Congress of the United States and to the platform of the Democratic Party in 1964 and to my own conscience and convictions. There are times when the platforms or the program of other organizations met the standards that I set for myself and my party. When that is the case, why, we agree.

If the gentleman from New York would spend a little more time reading the Congressional Record instead of his own publicity releases, he would have a better idea about the kind of record we have in Congress. But, as I said before, I don't think he is really serious about all this, anyway.

Question. You only agree with the ADA as long as it agrees with the Democratic platform?

Senator Humphrey. I agree with the Democratic platform and support it, and I think you know that and we are not going to play word games.

Question. But you haven't answered the question raised by Congressman Miller, that the ADA, as far as the recognition of Red China as one issue he threw out. The question is here, do you support that position of the ADA of which you happen to be a member?

Senator Humphrey. I think it is more important to know what Senator Humphrey's position is. I have constantly opposed recognition of Red China, including its admission into the UN, and Congressman Miller knows it, and a man who seeks high public office should always try to state the truth.

Question. Senator, how would you characterize your role in this campaign as distinguished from the role the President is going to play?

Senator Humphrey. The President will obviously be very busy as President of the United States. These are troublesome times on the international front. They are days that require constant attention to the responsibilities of the Government of the United States. President Johnson will spend a good deal of his time in Washington as our Chief Executive and as our President.

I will try, to the best of my ability, to conduct, carry on the campaign for our ticket and attend as many meetings as possible and visit as many States as time will permit. I will have to do this also in recognition of my responsibilities as Majority Whip of the United States Senate, which at this time, of course, means I have to be in Washington a good deal of the time.

Question. Senator, when is Congress going to wind up?

Senator Humphrey. Mr. Mazo, I hope that it winds up very promptly, and I would say that we have a chance to get the Congress wound up -- we have a chance for the Congress to complete its work before the -- by the first week of September, I would say, somewhere around September 25th, not later than October 1.

Question. Senator, are you saying that most of the campaigning around the country will be done by you rather than the President?

Senator Humphrey. It appears that at least for some time, until the Congress has completed its work, that I will carry on a good deal of the campaigning. But the President will, of course, participate and very effectively so. I gather that his schedule is primarily related to the month of October. He will do a good job when he goes out. You don't have to have the champ out too many times, you know.

Question. Senator, Barry Goldwater is claiming a strong tide in the West. Do you think that your visit alone, without the President's help, will offset that tide?

Senator Humphrey. Well, I would imagine that just conducting the affairs of Government would be the best way to gain support in the West. If anyone man seems to have popular support in the western States, as I have traveled through these States many times in the past year, it is President Lyndon Johnson. Campaign or no campaign, he has support.

The best politics is just to do what you are supposed to do when you are in Government, when you have the responsibility of public office. And the programs of the Democratic Administration, I believe, are well accepted in the west and are appreciated and supported, and I hope that I can add just a little to the strength of the ticket by coming out here to explain these programs, to again proclaim them and remind people of them.

Question. Senator, do you know if President Johnson will come to Colorado in October?

Senator Humphrey. I do not. I hope he will, because I know he would receive a great reception here. But I have no information that tells me that this is currently planned.

Question. Senator, would you like to campaign in either Alabama or Mississippi or both?

Senator Humphrey. If I am asked, I would be more than happy to go there. As a matter of fact, it is my intention to go into as many States in the south as time will permit. As you know, in the press, next week I will be in Arkansas and Texas. I have also been invited into Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Florida. I hope to be able to go and I will go into Kentucky and Tennessee and Oklahoma, and Louisiana. And I have been invited to the University of Alabama. If I can find it in my schedule, I hope that I can accept it.

Question. What tack will your campaigning take in the south?

Senator Humphrey. Just like it takes any other place. There is only one country, just one United States, one law for all of our people and one Constitution. I, of course, will speak to them of some of the programs in which they are particularly interested and the programs that the Democratic Party has been able to advance.

For example, our southern friends and neighbors are deeply interested in agriculture. I shall cite to them the record of the Democratic Administration and of the President, and Senator Humphrey as compared to the opposition.

I will talk of industrialization, of economic development and opportunity, of civil rights, every issue.

Question. Will you emphasize civil rights?

Senator Humphrey. I will give it the emphasis that it properly deserves, yes, sir.

Question. Goldwater said yesterday in Chicago again that he didn't think he had quite as much support down south as a lot of Republicans think he might have. What is your view?

Senator Humphrey. I will accept Mr. Goldwater's verdict. He is getting closer to the truth all the time.

Question. Senator, would you be responsive to any invitation to debate the issues publicly with any of the candidates for the opposition?

Senator Humphrey. I have always considered that we are conducting a debate all the time. I keep reading what the Republican candidates say, and I imagine occasionally they read what we are saying. I am hopeful that the people are reading and listening and viewing what we are saying. If the time is appropriate and the occasion arises, I would have no hesitancy at all in engaging in discussion or debate if it would prove to be profitable or interesting.

Question. Have you had any such invitation?

Senator Humphrey. Not yet.

Question. Were you disturbed by the fact that Senator Goldwater chose your home town of Minneapolis to talk about lawlessness?

Senator Humphrey. Yes, I was at least intrigued, because of all the cities in the United States that has a fine record for observance, law and order, for good government, I think Minneapolis ranks among the top numbers of those cities. It is a city of homes and of churches and good schools and responsible, law-abiding citizens. But Mr. Goldwater seems to be trying to make a campaign issue out of local law enforcement. As I have said a number of times, when I was Mayor and candidate for Mayor, I ran on the issue of local law enforcement. But I don't believe as a candidate for President you try to take over the duties of the local chief of police or the mayor.

I think it might be a little more helpful if the Republican candidate for President were to encourage law observance and not only by asking that the law be enforced, but also that the social and economic conditions in this country, wherever they may be faulty, be improved.

I wish he would show as much interest in the housing of people who are poorly housed, in the education of students, of young people who are poorly educated, as he does in lecturing chiefs of police and mayors and governors about their failure to keep law and order in their communities.

I think what some of our local officials would like is a little cooperation and help on some of the basic social problems which tend to promote social tension.

Question. Senator, do you feel that this emphasis on local law enforcement by the opposition party is really a way of emphasizing the civil rights issue?

Senator Humphrey. I have been forced to that conclusion, because Mr. Goldwater has said, regrettably, I must say, that the Civil Rights Act promotes hatred and violence and bitterness. I don't think that is true at all. I think that those forces were present before the Act. And it should be stated now, and this is as good a place to say it as anywhere else, that most of the public officials of this country have spoken up for the observance of the law. And in the southern States, there is a pattern of law observance and of compliance with the Civil Rights statutes that is nothing short of amazing in the recent weeks since the passage of that Act. These states ought to be praised for the adjustments that they are making and these adjustments have not been easy; we know that. It is not easy to change the long-established social patterns. But very little praise has been given to them.

So I raise my voice in commendation, in praise, and in thanks for the courage and for the cooperation of citizens everywhere and of law enforcement officials and public officials, north and south and east and west, in reference to the application of a civil rights bill that emphasizes voluntarism and local cooperation.

Question. Senator Goldwater keeps referring to rioting in the streets. How would you describe that -- his remarks?

Senator Humphrey. Well, I have tried to indicate to you that I think that this is taken, really, out of the context of the totality, of the fullness of American life, specific instances and making it appear as if it is a national pastime, or a national pattern.

It is very peaceful in Denver today, beautiful city. People look fine and healthy and well dressed. There are fine public institutions here, you have a fine mayor. You have been doing great things in the great West here, all over. I would say that there there are problems of law enforcement, they are best handled by your local people.

Question. Senator, do you consider Goldwater to be a sane, responsible conservative, and if so, do you think he is a prisoner of the nuts and the kooks?

Senator Humphrey, Oh, I wouldn't make any such charge as that. I have said a number of times, and I want to repeat it, that I have a fine personal relationship with Senator Goldwater and this is not just a political statement; it is a fact. I respect him as a man and as a fine citizen. I disagree with his point of view very strongly and many people gather around, candidates that are anything but helpful, and all I ask of the Senator is that when persons who do not seem to fit into the ideals of American life support him, that he repudiate and reject their support, just as I would. We need no Ku Kluxers, no Birchites, no Communists, no extremists. We don't need their support and we reject it. And that is a statement for the Democratic candidates.

Question. Thank you very much, Senator.

= = =

Denver Club, September 12, 1964

Senator Humphrey. Thank you very much, Palmer. I appreciate this effort at fiction that you have just gone through. I now know why he is such a great publisher and editor, because he can take a fellow like Hubert Humphrey and make him sound like he is something.

Palmer, Mr. Hoyt, I want to thank you from the bottom of my heart for your warm reception, your introduction and for the honor and privilege of your friendship.

May I just pay my respects here to Mr. Foster of the Rocky Mountain News, to my colleagues in this worthy endeavor called politics, those that are in now, those that were in and those that seek to get in. May I say that the best thing is to be in, seeking is second best, and out -- I don't have much for that!

You have indicated that Capital College closed its doors shortly after I left and there is some truth to that. As a matter of fact, it is a fact. It reminds me, so that you will be prepared, at this Athletic Club, not long ago I spoke at Newell, Minnesota. We have a place there called Turner Hall. It is a community where the citizens are of German descent and the boys gather at Turner Hall for their sort of fraternal club and have a pretty good time. I was invited down one evening to make a speech. I gave a speech and it was a ripper, just going after them. The headlines next morning read "Humphrey Gives Hot Speech; Turner Hall Burns."

So you can see, you can never tell what will happen.

Now, Mr. Scher, I understand that you would like this to be conducted as a question and answer operation. I think that every taxpayer, every American citizen, is entitled to one bite of a live United States Senator. So with that as preface and as sort of an invitation, why don't you take off and let's see what we can do.

Please identify yourself and then just ask the question.

Who is first?

Question: Senator, you hinted some time back that there would be a new look at agriculture. What would that new look disclose that we don't already know about that part of the economy that is so vital to these western States?

Of course a corollary question goes with it. What can we hope to get to halt vertical integration, the trend of monopoly, the concentration of economic power, which is what the farm, agriculture, and small business is confronted with?

Nice question, Hu?

Senator Humphrey. I was just going to say. I would first want to remind you that I only plan on spending a few hours here today and my time here is rather limited.

The question is rather limited. The question is far-reaching, sweeping, and indeed a very meaningful and profound question, because it relates to the developments not only in our agricultural segment

of the economy, but the total economy as you have indicated.

What I have said is that much of the agricultural legislation that we presently have was passed and then amended or patched, relating to an agricultural economy which now is considerably different than it was at the time of its passage.

For example, we have what we call the basics in agriculture -- certain commodities that we call the basics, like cotton, wheat, and corn. Actually, there are many other commodities today that are much more basic in terms of income in agriculture than some of these. I think we, therefore, need to sort of get this whole agricultural program out of the immediate conflict of political argument and try to get it one step above it. I have proposed, therefore, that it appears now that a broadly based, well-organized, blue ribbon commission, appointed by the President of the United States, with confirmation by the members of the Senate, of citizens who are not in public life, in part, and persons who are in public life, to compose this commission. The number could be anywhere from 15 to 25, because I think you need enough members so that you give a broad -- have a broad cross-section of the nation.

What would this commission do?

Well, it would study, for example, such questions as these: No. 1, should we have what we call compensatory payments, production payments, as a means of assuring a degree, a fair degree of income, or a degree of fair income, for a farm producer or should we have what are the traditional crop loans and price supports. I happen to be one who believes that we are now entering a period where, because of the social values that are involved in the family farm, in order to keep, however, that family farm productive, you must have an increase in its size in some areas -- that it would be better to have what we call compensatory or production payments. I think this gives the free market the better opportunity to operate. It permits the normal practices in the market of the farm cooperative in its merchandising, of the grain trade in its merchandizing, of the cotton exchange in its merchandising, rather than have the Commodity Credit Corporation become the largest merchandising entity in the entire agricultural economy.

It is my view that the Commodity Credit Corporation was set up to supplement and not to supplant the normal facilities of the American agricultural distribution. That is one question.

No. 2, I think we ought to find out what is a surplus and what isn't. We go around talking all the time about the great surpluses we have. If we should happen to have an extensive growth throughout the entire Midwest, the breadbasket area, for example, let's say, in wheat, we may have no surplus at all, very well, because much of the wheat in storage is not wheat for milling purposes, much of the wheat is the type of wheat that we call good for feeding purposes, for livestock feed. We need to determine what are our strategic national reserves. How much should we carry as a national reserve for the security of this nation and then quit talking about the burden of surpluses.

It is my considered judgment as one man's opinion that much of what we presently have in storage is needed in storage just as much as businessmen need an inventory to operate his business and just as much as the Defense Department needs ammunition in supply to operate our military establishment.

But we are led to believe throughout the country that the minute you get 100 million bushels of feed grain in storage in Commodity Credit that somehow the farmers have over-produced, that they are just loading the government down with grain and the taxpayers are paying for it and it is a terrible, terrible mess. The real mess will be when you run short of feed grains with the amount of livestock we have in this country.

The real problem will be when you run short of wheat, how much can we afford to export? There is a great shortage in many parts of the world. We can over-export in various of our commodities and find ourselves in a predicament.

What about farm credit? The Farmers Home Administration has a totally inadequate base for its structure. Would loans cost so much today?

The loans made are designed primarily for a farm operation when a young man or young couple would set up when a \$20,000 farm is the average base in my part of the country. Today that farmer can't get a start for less than \$50,000 or \$60,000. He needs a credit base.

This is what I mean by taking a new look at agriculture and there are a lot of other things.

About the vertical integration, I think we have to face up to the fact, for example, that some of our farms are going to have to be bigger. This doesn't mean that you need corporate structure in agriculture. I do think we ought to take a good hard look in this business, however, of where you have a retail organization that has vertical integration, goes right down to the feeder lot in cattle, for example, and right on out, actually, to the calves; right on the range. That sort of operation interferes with what has been a basic distribution structure in this country and can literally break prices and cause the cattlemen and the cattle producer and the feeder a great deal of trouble. One of the real problems we have today in the cattle industry is right in that particular development.

Enough on that one. Now we will move along.

Mr. Scher . . . Who has a hot one?

Senator Humphrey. That was pretty good.

Question. I would like to continue that question just a little bit. The Administration has largely had its way on import legislation. Would you consider looking at your crystal ball sufficiently to tell us what you think is ahead for the cattlemen in this part of the country, please?

Senator Humphrey. Well, fortunately, the price of cattle is better right now. It is much higher than it was, let's say, in the month of May. There has been a considerable recovery. There is no doubt but what there was a heavy influx of imports back in 1963, more than was justified. But the facts are also quite revealing, that when those imports came in, it was primarily in a type of meat, as you know, for hamburger and hot dogs and what have you, a type of meat we don't have in too much supply in the United States, because we have developed a higher grade of beef.

The American consumer, the housewife, wants a better cut. In fact, one of our problems today on exports in Europe is that we have developed such a high type of animal product we are having a difficult time finding a good market for the high type of quality of meat we have in the United States.

Well, you know what happened when the price started to break, somewhat due to imports, more to an increase in population of cattle. When that price started to fall, the natural tendency on the part of the cattle raiser, particularly the feeder lots, was to hold those cattle. When you hold them, you add on more poundage. It isn't just the percentage of the population, it is also the tonnage and the poundage. When you took the poundage to the market, you started to break the price, so you held it a little longer so it became a vicious circle.

Then you have the short term credit, unfortunately. I think we have to get into an intermediate credit structure, not just one and two year loans, but four and five year loans, so a man can ride out the storm.

What about the future?

As it looks right now, because of the heavy sales of cattle in Europe, because of the drought in Europe, because of the drought in the Argentine and other problems there, because of the negotiated agreements we have with Australia, New Zealand, and with Mexico, we are in much better shape, there are fewer imports coming in. The imports are lower now than they have been for years and we have a good working relationship with these countries.

One of the reasons the pressure is off is they are shipping a lot into Western Europe. In the meantime, you know the President set up this commission of salesmen, a very competent group of men, sent them to Europe to look for new markets. We have never really explored for export markets for our beef products. Now, at long last, we are beginning to look for those export markets.

But as I recall, and I haven't my notebook on these, and these figures are a bit tricky, I believe the census is up about \$2 million projected for next year.

Isn't that about right, Dave?

About \$2 million. It is kind of hard to keep up on each of the items, but if that is the case and if the cattle are held too long, we could have -- let me see here. The cow herd on January 1, 1964, was 32 million head as compared with only 24 million in 1958, an increase of one-third. This is part of our problem. The number of cattle on feed continued to increase sharply and the number on feed in January 1964 was almost 9 million head or over 30 percent higher than 1958.

It looks now that we are going to have an increase again. The average market weights continued to increase and by the early spring of 1964, were some 70 pounds per animal higher than in 1958.

As a result of larger marketings at heavier weights, beef slaughter in 1963 exceeded that in 1962 by 8 percent. So you see what happened with the increases.

Now, the future? I think it looks fairly good if we can keep down the imports and we have legislation that permits the President -- let me put it this way, that gives the President a little more leverage

in our negotiations with our other countries, friendly countries. We did not have a sharp cut-off. I think that would have been somewhat dangerous. We knew that and we wanted to give the President the authority to constantly examine the import situation and if he found that the volume of imports was threatening the price structure in America, then he can impose quotas. This gives him that extra leverage that he needs when he bargains with Australia, with New Zealand, with Mexico, with the Argentine or with any of the other countries.

I would say if you are not expecting a bonanza but expecting a good normal income, the cattle industry looks good for the future.

Question. If that is all true, why doesn't the price at retail come down?

Senator Humphrey. That is one of the things we are looking into. That is exactly why we passed the Food Marketing Commission.

Question. Senator, what is your reaction to Senator Goldwater's income tax cut proposals?

Senator Humphrey. Well, I wish Mr. Goldwater had got his fiscal religion about 8 or 9 months earlier. Mr. Goldwater voted against the tax cut that was well thought out, upon which there had been months of hearings, that was the result of the calculations and the thoughtful analysis of dozens of economists and fiscal experts. He called that tax cut that we voted in the early months of 1964, he said it was a cynical business, that it was politically motivated. He made all kinds of charges about it. I notice now that in September, after the Congress had already voted a tax cut of a little over \$11-1/2 billion, which he voted against, Mr. Goldwater has come to the conclusion that we didn't do enough and that he advocates another 25 percent cut in the next five years, in a package along with other proposed tax cuts.

I personally believe Mr. Goldwater got his cynical statement on the wrong tax bill. He got a paragraph mixed up in his speech. If there is anything cynical about a proposal of tax reduction, it is the one he has just offered, because at the most conservative estimates, it means an estimated loss in revenue in the next five years of \$90 billion.

At the same time he is proposing that, he is proposing fantastic expansions in our defense budget, and it is no small item now.

I analyzed this this morning at Rapid City. I think the facts are something like this. He proposes to substitute a manned bomber for the B-52 which will cost, according to the Department of Defense in its cost analysis, not less than \$10 billion over and above what we are spending. He proposes an anti-ballistic missile system to protect our cities which is an estimated cost of \$20 billion, and that is no small item. And shelters would certainly have to be built around such cities we are protecting. That is a couple of billion dollars.

He proposes an expansion in our space budget of \$7.5 billion. He says our military space budget is too small, even though we are spending a billion and a-half. He asks for immediate construction of another nuclear aircraft carrier, which is about \$400 million. He has really gone down the line for a good many expenditures.

In the same breath, he says balance the budget, and then he says reduce the taxes. I must say that this represents, to be most charitable, rank irresponsibility.

Question. Could we get a determination, please, sir from Mr. Hoyt as to whether these questions are off or on the record?

Senator Humphrey. Everything is on the record here. I presume that is generally the way when I am out on the road.

Mr. Scher. I might point out that Sigma Delta Chi is strongly supporting the freedom of information bill in the House that is now tied up. You might help us if you can.

Senator Humphrey. May I say we have a lot of things to get through that Congress before we leave and most of the boys want to leave.

Question. Senator, the opposition is making a good deal of capital, apparently, of this rioting in the streets issue. What will be the answer of your ticket to that, if any, rioting in the streets.

Senator Humphrey. I am very familiar with the issue and I think that again represents an emotional appeal to the American people. I have been a Mayor of the city of Minneapolis. I never ever did feel that the Federal Government in Washington was in charge of the police department in my city. In fact, if they had tried to be in charge of it, I think I would have deeply resented it. I don't want to live in a country that has a Federal police. There are some countries that have such institutions and instruments of law and order, as they call them. They generally turn into being anything but instruments of law and order. They become instruments of tyranny and authoritarianism. So we must rely for law and order upon local instrumentality, upon citizen law observance, upon a sense of citizen morality. Most people it has been said obey the law out of habit because we are brought up to be law-abiding citizens.

Now, my fellow Americans, there are people all over the world today who are restless. We came out of a war that shattered not only economies, that destroyed not only cities and social values. It is not possible in a few moments to give a thoughtful, analytical dissertation on what happened to this world following World War I. But after every great war, there are always indications of the change in values or a change in the moral structure, and frequently not for the good.

But Mr. Goldwater's constant reference to rioting in the streets is an unfair picture of America.

Most people are law-abiding. Why doesn't he tell you about the traffic accidents? There are more of them today than there have ever been, too. And there are more people that overpark their cars today than ever before. And there are more people today, if you please, that get into little troubles because there are more people. And this is a more crowded and a more highly geared-up society.

I think that this constant charge of disorder and lawlessness which has been made, which has not just been referred to certain specific instances, but a general charge, is an insult and an unfair comment. It is an insult to every law enforcement officer, to every mayor, to every chief of police, to every sheriff, to every constable, to every judge, and to every person in public authority.

He was in my City of Minneapolis and made a speech on law and order. Why didn't he say in that city that the former Mayor of the City of Minneapolis had been awarded a citation from the Federal Bureau of Investigation during my tenure as mayor for having had the finest record of law enforcement, law and order of any major city in the United States?

We drove out the rackets. We cleaned up a police department and the people of Minneapolis are decent, law-abiding, God-fearing, family-loving people. And I don't need a candidate for President to come into Minneapolis and lecture us on law and order and rioting in the streets. That is number one.

Furthermore, I might add, the gentleman from Arizona is not contributing to a sense of balance and reason and understanding and forbearance and law observance by saying, for example, that the Civil Rights Act promotes bitterness and hatred. And that is what he said, and leads to violence. What he ought to be saying is that it is the duty, the citizen's duty and responsibility of every thoughtful, decent American citizen to try to live by the law, to understand the law, to observe the law, to seek voluntary compliance with the law, and if we can't get it that way, to seek enforcement of the law. That is what we need from every person in America today.

I don't know what the answer of the Senator is to the youngsters around here in Oregon that had a field day on Labor Day. I don't know what the answer was up in New Hampshire when there were a group of teenagers up there that were having fun and getting a little out of hand. But I am a father and I would be less than honest with you if I told you that once in a while the Humphrey kids couldn't get a little out of line. I don't want them involved in violence, I don't want them involved in riots, and they haven't been, thank goodness. But there are times in this type of geared-up society where you have an automobile in the hands of everybody, where there are old institutions that have been broken down, where families have been moved, where old roots have been cut. There are times when this can get out of hand.

But this doesn't make America a flesh pot. I am tired of hearing about how evil our country is. I don't think it is a bit more evil than it ever was. I think there are more people checking up on each other than ever before. I just left my home town of Doland, South Dakota, yesterday. I got into a few pranks up there and if they had caught me, they would have said I was a delinquent. The fact of the matter is that most people in America respect the law, love their country, are good citizens, do their job, and they ought to be praised and they ought to be commended. Those that don't ought to be reprimanded, to be sure, and the law ought to be brought upon them.

But let's not go around running down our country. This person is not going to do that. I don't think the young folks of our country today are any worse than you folks were or than I was. I don't think the adults are, either.

You got me on a kind of heart-felt subject, by the way. I will come to Harlem a little later with you.

Question. Senator, last week on Meet The Press, the founder of the John Birch Society said they will not come out for any candidate. They are supposedly neutral, politically speaking. As you go along the campaign trail, does this seem to be true to you, or is there an undercurrent? Are they really getting into the campaign but saying they are not?

Senator Humphrey. The spokesman for the John Birch Society possibly made his first constructive statement when he said they are not going to get into this campaign. I hope they won't. I am not going to accuse anybody of having solicited the support of the John Birch Society. I will say this, that neither Lyndon B. Johnson nor Hubert H. Humphrey wants anything to do with them. The further they are away from us and the less we hear from them, the happier we will be and the happier America will be.

Question. In 1960, this State voted Republican for whoever that was. In 1962, we voted -- they voted Republican for Governor. In 1964, why should they change trends?

Senator Humphrey. Because they were wrong two times before, that is one of the reasons. And I have a feeling they will change the trend, I really do.

Question. Is the Vietnamese situation as bad as it is reported and are any changes in policy contemplated?

Senator Humphrey. Well, it is indeed a very complex and difficult situation. It surely is not hopeless. It is not good. But it will not be improved by running away from it or pretending that you can find some easy answers. This Administration does not have any intention of withdrawing from Vietnam and letting the Viet Cong, the Communist forces, overrun all of Southeast Asia. This Administration has no plans of accelerating the war and extending it to the north. This Administration intends to pursue what it believes, first of all, is a policy of political pacification, gaining some political stability in South Vietnam, which is a very difficult task but one we think we can obtain in cooperation with the Vietnamese people, and of supporting the Vietnamese Government in its efforts to thwart terrorism, infiltration, and open aggression. And we are going to watch it and take whatever steps are necessary to follow that policy of preserving the political integrity and sovereignty of Vietnam. Once that is obtained and once we find ourselves in a position of relative balance and strength in Vietnam, where the Vietnamese government has some degree of stability, where the military forces of South Vietnam have been able to repel the invaders and the infiltrators, then is the hour and the time to sit down and negotiate. Prior to that, to negotiate would be to negotiate with a gun at your head and we are not yet ready to do that. The sooner we get this across to the people of the world, the better. This government has no intention of being intimidated, blackmailed, has no intention of sitting down with any Communist force and negotiating on their terms. We will negotiate only when we feel that negotiations can result in a reasonable, honorable settlement, and provide for what was once designed as the policy of South Vietnam, its political non-alignment, its political neutrality and its territorial integrity. That is our policy.

Question. Senator, do you have any comment to make concerning some of the charges that have been made against you concerning your

relationship with ADA?

Senator Humphrey. Oh, I expected that. As a matter of fact, you know, if I thought that fellow that is making those charges were serious, I would be worried about them. Really, you ought not to let a former chairman of a political party make any charges for about a year after he is out as head of the party, because he loses his objectivity when he is a part of the political mechanism.

The Vice Presidential candidate for the other party, the fellow who is making these charges, he is a fine fellow. Somebody prepares this stuff for him and he reads it well. He is a fine actor. I have been with him before. I hope he is enjoying it. I don't mind being the lightning rod for the Democratic ticket and if they think they can strike me down, they should have been in Minnesota. Out in Minnesota, we know the ADA stands for American Dairy Association and we are strongly for it.

Question. I wonder if you would care to comment on lightning striking the Bobby Baker case. Will we get a report on that before the election?

Senator Humphrey. I imagine there will be some more reports. There was one already. That case has got about as much attention as you could give to it. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has a number of agents working on it and I don't think that Mr. J. Edgar Hoover is any partisan, he doesn't take any political instructions. It has the Justice Department working on it, it has the Internal Revenue Service working on it, it has most of the Republicans working on it and a good share of the Democrats. I think it is getting about as much ventilating, airing, analysis and investigation as anything could. We instructed the committee just the other day, now, to look into these most recent allegations.

I might add that this is a political season and I wouldn't want to impune anyone's motives, but I sat in the Senate the day before yesterday, and my goodness, I saw a lot of would be investigators up there making speeches. They weren't half as interested in investigating Persian rugs. Somebody said that we were sweeping things under the rug, and I heard one fellow say that must have been the one that Sherman Adams got. We are not going to sweep anything under anybody's rug, not even Sherman's rug, it will be brought out whatever needs to be.

Question. Senator, you have called attention to the fact that information is one of our most important resources and I know you have been responsible for some hearings on the information explosion. Can you tell us what your plans are on this matter for the future?

Senator Humphrey. Yes, your question refers in particular to information in the scientific and technical areas.

Question. Right.

Senator Humphrey. It has been my view that with the Federal Government spending such vast sums of money in the fields of research and development and because, of course, there has been such a large amount spent in the private sector, there has been an information explosion, where the information rolls out much faster than the capacity of the people who need this information to assimilate it. Therefore, what we have been recommending is information centers, so to speak, to correlate and collate this volume of information that flows, for

example, through the National Institutes of Health. One thing we did get done was the cataloging and listing of all research projects, to get away from what appears to be unnecessary duplication. We were finally able to get in the Department of Defense now, through a system of these computer machines, 120,000 research projects where all of the information, all the material developed from these research projects is now indexed, collated, and extracted so that it is readily available to industrial firms, to private individuals and to scientists all over the United States. It is my view that an information clearinghouse, for example, on drugs, being a pharmacist, is very important. Had we had it, there never would have been the problem with thalidomide. There would never have been the problem with some of the other drugs we presently have.

Instead of being critical of the particular drug firms that have developed these products, what has actually happened is that much information has been available but not known to a particular firm. And it needs to be worldwide, not just in the United States.

So we have made some approaches. We already have a World Health Organization on getting together the beginnings of an international drug and medical information clearinghouse. The American Medical Association now, in cooperation with the drug companies and the American Pharmaceutical Association, is now setting up a huge clearinghouse on drug information.

And the Government of the United States is beginning to do this now in the Food and Drug Administration and in the Public Health Service. So we are making progress.

But you have to keep at it. This isn't one of those things that has any political sex appeal. It doesn't. This is just a labor of love and you have to work at it and work on it.

I have held hundreds of hearings on it and we have taken hundreds of pages of testimony, but we are working on it and it will be to the benefit of the country.

Question. Senator, several months ago, Thomas Mann was quoted as saying that we no longer particularly cared what kind of governments Latin America countries had so long as they lined up with us against Communism. Since the Alliance for Progress is based pretty heavily upon reforming government, and quite a few of the governments need reform, what is the future of the Alliance now?

Senator Humphrey. First of all, my friend, I do not believe that Mr. Mann was properly interpreted or even quoted, if that was the case.

Question. It was an AP story.

Senator Humphrey. I know Mr. Mann and know him well.

This government is committed to the development of constitutional governments in Latin America. We also recognize that there are times that we have to deal with governments here and elsewhere that are not freely elected. But we do not encourage it, we deplore it, and we seek in our negotiations to promote in the most rapid fashion possible constitutional processes to have free elections.

Take, for example, in the Argentine and now in Brazil. We are insisting in our relationships in Brazil that the date for free elections and the restoration of constitutional government, elected constitutional government, be set as soon as possible.

Mr. Mann is committed to the Alliance for Progress and Hubert Humphrey is committed to the Alliance for Progress, and President Lyndon Johnson, above all, is committed to the charter of Punta del Este, to the Alliance for Progress and to the Organization of American States. And I believe you will see and you are witnessing a much better relationship in Latin America with our country than before.

Of course, Mr. Kennedy, the late beloved President, was really the inspiration for the Alliance for Progress, and he left a tremendous impact in this area of the world.

But I would remind you that in the recent meeting of the OAS, 13 of the 14 countries have now -- there is only one country that has not up to date applied sanctions to Cuba and that one is Mexico and Mexico has a traditional policy of recognition of doing business with any country in Latin America that has a regime in power. But even Uruguay, which we thought might not be with us, has come through. I think we have done quite well and I want to assure you that our commitment is as strong as it ever was. If Hubert Humphrey is permitted to serve with President Lyndon Johnson, I know I will be able to help make that commitment not only a promise and a pledge but a full fledged reality.

Question. Thursday morning, prior to flying to Minneapolis from Seattle, Senator Goldwater said he wouldn't be a bit surprised to see another Cuban crisis arise before the election. Do you have any comment on that?

Senator Humphrey. Yes, my comment on that, I think, was better stated by a great journalist and columnist and commentator, Mr. James Reston, than anything I might say.

I can only paraphrase what he said but what he said was the truth. Mr. Goldwater was, regrettably, insinuating that the crisis in 1962 was a sort of politically manipulated matter, which it was not, and as has been indicated, the removal of those missiles -- first of all, the ascertaining of the presence of the missiles, was ascertained to a specific date by our overflights by the United States, by the Central Intelligence Agency. And all Mr. Goldwater has to do is to take advantage of the opportunity which the President of the United States has made available to him to see every report of this Government to have all of the information of the Central Intelligence Agency, all of the information of the intelligence services of the Air Force, the Army or the Navy or any other instrument of our government.

And he does not either dignify himself or give honor to his rank as a reserve General when he makes these insinuations and these misleading comments about critical international developments and situations.

We are not going to have any timely Cuban crisis. If there is a Cuban crisis or any other crisis, it will be met, whatever day it comes. And we don't intend to have political profit on the basis of crisis or misery. This Administration is running on the basis of a program of opportunity and of happiness and of hope and of a better

future for the American people, not on our troubles and our difficulties.

Anyone else?

Question. Senator, I wonder what the views of the Administration are toward the development of an oil shale industry, particularly in Colorado, with some allied interest in Wyoming and Utah?

Senator Humphrey. I really can't give you a detailed answer on it because it is not always possible for one to know all the intimate details of a program. But the Democrats helped initiate the pilot projects for the development of an oil shale industry. We are interested in the development of our natural resources,

I would speak, speaking for my self, and I served in the Congress with the distinguished Senator, Ed Johnson, and your distinguished Senator, John Carroll, and I think that we always worked together to preserve the beginnings of that great industry. I would hope that I could give you an assurance that the Democrats will be for the development of whatever natural resource we have any place in this country, including oil shale.

Question. Senator, how do you answer this well known sense of frustration that we feel that this country can't have its way all over the world? The other side of that question might be, can we be a policeman in all this crisis and change in the world?

Senator Humphrey. It appears to me that our political opposition is playing on the frustrations of the American people. We are a can-do people, you know. We like to get things done. We generally face up to emergencies in an emergency way, you know, just tearing into it.

One of the characteristics of America in the past, in the foreign policy and its defense policy, for a long period of time was either all out, or dead stop. We never found a cruising speed. We either had little or no defense or we had massive armies on the occasion of a war. For a long period of time, we said the rest of the world would have to take care of itself, we were isolated, we had total isolation, so to speak, from the rest of the world.

There is a tendency now on the part of some people to want to try to dictate to people all over the world. We have gone from one extreme to the other in the minds of some. At one time we wanted to have nothing to do with people, now have everything to do with them and tell them what to do.

We are not in that position any more. The power structure has changed a great deal. For a time after World War II, there were two major powers, the Soviet Union with its massive armies and the United States of America. But now things have changed.

First of all, the Soviet Union can't even boss its own satellite countries. It is split not only down the middle but pie-like all over. But the basic split is between the Soviet Communists and the Chinese Communists.

We in the United States, while we have massive power, while we have the greatest conglomeration of power that the world has ever known, we are not in a position, unless we want to be sheer imperialists, which we do not want to be, of dictating to everybody and telling everybody to behave or impose our will. There ~~is~~, what we seek to do is demonstrate through the organizations available to us, through the United Nations, through the World Bank, through the Inter-American Development Bank, through the Organization of American States, through the alliances like NATO, SEATO and CENTO. This is a complicated process. What I would advise Americans to do is to recognize that you are living at a time when the old world was shattered and a new world is being created and constructed. The question is, can we help mold the design and the pattern of this new world in the framework of greater freedom for more and more people, of greater opportunity for more and more people?

Now, this will not come because we order it. It can come if we build it. I think the greatest speech that John Kennedy ever gave was that speech at American University on June 10, 1963, when he reminded everyone of us that peace is a process. You must work for it. You must build it stone by stone and step by step and inch by inch and year by year. If you try to create it at once, it can only be done by massive force and that surely is no peace. If you ignore it, the challenge of peace, it will result in a complete breakdown of social order and an imposition of totalitarian structure.

So what we need is some confidence in ourselves. We didn't build this America that we live in today overnight. You didn't build the west as it is today in just one decade or even one generation. It took a long time. And anyone who believes in the Democratic process knows that it takes infinite patience and perseverance. You have to be patiently persevering without becoming impatient and impetuous. You have to be firm and resolute without being belligerent and arrogant. And you have to develop what instrumentalities are needed to encourage development, encourage the design of the kind of a world in which there is greater freedom, greater opportunity. So if we are frustrated, the only thing I can say about that is if the American people yield to frustration, then the Communists have won their victory. But if we discipline ourselves to the long ordeal of creating the kind of a society that we know and that other people know is needed, a society in which human dignity is the central objective and ideal, the attainment and the protection of human dignity, if we can discipline ourselves to a process that will ultimately yield a greater respect for human dignity, then we are the victors. And the real difference between the totalitarian society and our society is the respect for the dignity of man. That is the difference, the ultimate difference. I am not going to do anything -- well, I hope I will never do anything, either privately or publicly, that will reveal a temptation to the frustrations of our time.

Actually, my friends, we are winning. You think we have problems? You think we have difficulties? Look at the difficulties around the world in the Communist bloc. We are winning. Western Europe is strong; it is so strong that it can talk back to us. It is so rich that it is its own banker again. Latin America is making improvements.

Oh, I know there are problems. But there are more textbooks in Latin America tonight than there have been ever before in all the great history of that continent. And we helped print them and they talk the story and they read the story of human freedom and dignity.

There are more children in Latin America today receiving a free school lunch than in all the previous history of that continent. There are more free governments in Latin America elected today than ever before.

The Communists aren't winning.

Mr. Khrushchev himself every day has to yield on a point of dogma and doctrine. He goes back to the eastern provinces, as he calls them,

back into Siberia, and what does he tell his farmers? "You must have incentive." He praises capitalist agriculture.

What does he tell his governments that he manages? He says "we have got to give more freedom to our scientists," The fresh air of freedom has broken through the Iron curtain.

This country hasn't gone Communist or Socialist. There is more free enterprise and more profitable free enterprise and more freedom in America today than there has ever been in the history of our great nation. More people are free to go to school. More people are going to school. More people are free because of their jobs and their income. You are free to get into your car and drive half way across the continent, or all the way if you want to. You are free to change your job. You are free to vote or not to vote. You are free to vote for Goldwater, though I hope you don't do that.

We have all kinds of freedoms. So I think we are doing all right.

- - -



# news release

FROM THE **DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE** PUBLICITY DIVISION 1730 K STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON 6, D.C. FEDERAL 3-8750

FOR RELEASE AFTER  
6:45 P.M. (MST), SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 12

B-3728

TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY

by

SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY  
DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE FOR VICE PRESIDENT  
DENVER, COLORADO  
SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 12

The pioneers who fought and trudged and thirsted and starved their way west were sustained by visions of a better life for themselves and their children. They surveyed the rich land. They gazed at the shining sky and the towering mountains. They breathed in the clean sweet air, and they said "Yes...yes." This is the land and we are the ones to bring reality to our dream.

Those pioneers boldly said "Yes" to life... "Yes" to nature... "Yes" to America. We today must humbly, yet emphatically, also say "Yes" to life... and to its challenges.

We contrast our affirmation of hope to the "No...no...a thousand times no" of the temporary spokesman for the Republican Party.

-- When we sought to guarantee the basic rights of human dignity under the Constitution, Americans said "Yes" and we passed a civil rights act.

But Senator Goldwater said "No."

-- When we finally achieved an opportunity to end the pouring of radioactive, lethal poison into the air, Americans said "Yes" and we ratified a test ban on airborne nuclear explosions.

But Senator Goldwater said "No."

-- When we agreed that a carefully formulated tax cut would provide the necessary stimulus to continuing prosperity, Americans said "Yes" and we passed the tax reduction act of 1964.

But Senator Goldwater said "No."

(more)

PAGE 2

B-3728

HUMPHREY/"...said "No."

-- When, in this great land of plenty, we found somber pockets of degradation, of hunger, of hopelessness, Americans said "Yes" to the anti-poverty act to furnish food and clothes and training and jobs...and, above all, hope, to the poor.

But Senator Goldwater said "No."

-- When we favored strengthening and encouraging and insuring the survival of the United Nations as one of the vital hopes for world peace, Americans said "Yes" and we approved the bond issue which has kept this organization alive.

But Senator Goldwater said "No."

-- When we developed a farm program to help the farmer who risks his livelihood against the uncertainties of nature, Americans said "Yes" and we passed legislation to protect the dedicated, hardworking men and women who have made this country the granary of the world.

But Senator Goldwater said "No."

-- When we discovered the older citizens in this country, through no fault of their own, desperately needing hospital insurance under social security, Americans said "Yes" and we passed the medicare legislation.

But Senator Goldwater said "No."

The Republican platform of 1960 offered specific proposals on 25 major issues.

But Senator Goldwater said "No" to all 25.

How wrong, how irresponsible, how fearful, can a candidate for President get? What do you say to a candidate with this record of "No," "No," "No?"

Let me tell you: you must say "No...one hundred million times no" to Senator Goldwater on election day.

"No demands nothing more; it is an end in itself. But "Yes" opens up the difficult paths of hard work, of experimentation, of creativity...and of progress.

(more)

Americans believe in the Open Mind. We know that the mind is like a parachute-- it functions best when open. The Open Mind is the society of youth...and those who think young. It is the society of vigor, of challenge, and it says "Yes" to the crucial issues of our times.

The Open Mind proclaims that all things are possible, and this proclamation leads inevitably to the West's vital contribution to our Nation: the spirit of DISCOVERY.

Discovery was the magic of the dream which kept our pioneers moving forward when maps were vague and security was unknown. Discovery...uncharted, unconforming, unproved...was the elixir which kept our great grandfathers plodding one more mile after one more mile.

We are now embarked on another exciting Age of Discovery...we are discovering the secrets of the moon, the sun and the stars. We are unlocking the mysteries and the might of the atom. But perhaps our greatest discoveries are not those requiring millions of miles of inter-planetary travel but those right here on the planet Earth.

We are thrilled by the exploits of our astronauts in outer space. But as Americans we should find equal satisfaction in exciting achievements in the human sphere -- our recent actions to feed the hungry, to house the dispossessed, and to bind up the wounds of those deprived of the good life by the accident of birth, or the afflictions of old age.

There are those few among us, the naysayers, who reject the very thought of Discovery. It shakes them up. It frightens them. It makes them think. It pulls their heads out of the sand.

They battle against every new Discovery. They are such prisoners of their negativism that they deny the existence of the great things we Americans have already achieved.

For instance, the temporary spokesman for the Republicans recently accused this Democratic Administration of creating an "artificial prosperity" for America.

PAGE 4  
B-3728  
HUMPHREY/"...for America."

Would you call the weekly wages of 72 million Americans -- up 4.8 million from January 1961 -- artificial?

Would you call the average factory worker's weekly wage of \$103 per week -- up from \$89 in January 1961 -- artificial?

Would you call a gross national product of \$625 billion -- up 23 percent from January 1961 -- artificial?

Would you call the unemployment rate of 4.9% achieved in July 1964 -- down from 6.7% of January 1961 -- artificial?

Would you call the record of price stability -- held to 1.2% each year since 1961 -- artificial?

Would you call the 43 consecutive months -- the longest peacetime economic expansion in history -- artificial?

The only artificial aspect of this prosperity is the artificial eye glasses through which Senator Goldwater looks at these happy and hard facts of a burgeoning, prosperous America.

And what would Senator Goldwater do about changing this "artificially prosperous" land of ours?

Perhaps he would reduce those "artificial" wages so that our "artificially" employed workers would not be able to buy those "artificial" cars so that we wouldn't use so much "artificial" steel.

But as for me...and as for most Americans...this prosperity is no illusion. It is real. It is here. And we prefer the dream we have achieved to the nightmare offered us by Barry in Blunderland.

I believe that the western spirit is best expressed in helping one another: The pooling of resources in the wagon train...the pitching in to rebuild a neighbor's barn burned down...the protection of a widow and her children when a young husband dies.

(more)

The West understands frontiers, old and new, better than any other section of our country. For those who say we Americans have no more frontiers to cross...for those who claim we should stop moving ahead and start moving backward...I say this is just some more of Barry's Buncombe.

Wherever in this great land there is a family which is ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed, I say there is a frontier to be crossed. Wherever there is a bright child who cannot afford to attend a school which will further stretch his mind, I say there is a frontier to be crossed. Wherever there are old people who have been abandoned and cannot pay for the good health which will make their golden years worth living, I say there is a frontier to be crossed. Where there are rat-infested tenements, where there are crime-filled streets, where there are poisoned streams or poisoned minds, I say there are frontiers which the good people in all sections of our country desire to cross.

And cross them we will. For the same spirit which won the West can conquer our new frontiers of waste and disease, of hunger and despair, of futility and fear.

A people which made deserts bloom can make cities sing. A land which has fed the hungry of the world can fire the spirits of the downtrodden. A nation which has planted the seeds of justice in our Bill of Rights can rip out the weeds of injustice from the tracts of racism and reaction.

We are not afraid of the Ku Klux Klan which would put on white sheets to cloak dark purposes; or some Birchites who would put up the noose of calumny for a courageous Chief Justice; or the Minutemen who would raise the sights of their well-oiled rifles against tolerance and brotherly love. We will not abandon sound judgment to the fury of vigilantes.

But we cannot promise easy answers, sugar-coated solutions, and bland assurances in this day of challenge and crises. The problems of our nation and of the world are tremendous, and the answers must come not only from the best and the brightest and the most creative men and women, but they must also come from the collective strength and wisdom of all our people. For we believe in the people. We say "Yes" to the people of this magnificent land.

(more)

PAGE 6

B-3728

HUMPHREY/"...magnificent land."

We do not fear a free press which informs the people. We welcome an enlightened electorate which will make a free choice.

We do not believe that every man is good, but we do believe he is capable of good.

We do not believe man has already fashioned the Great Society, but we do believe he has caught an unforgettable glimpse of it, and is on his way.

The West was won by vision, by sacrifice, by courage. And as we possess the qualities today, we shall win the future. From the bottom of my heart, I believe with William Faulkner that "man will not merely endure; he will prevail."

////

*Sp: Denver, Colo.  
Sept. 12, 1964*

DENVER, COLORADO, EVENING SPEECH

THE SPIRIT OF THE WEST AND THE GREAT SOCIETY

Saturday, September 12, 1964

The pioneers who fought and trudged and thirsted  
and starved their way west were sustained by visions  
of a better life for themselves and their children.

They surveyed the rich land. They gazed at the shining  
sky and the towering mountains. They breathed in the  
clean sweet air, and they said "Yes....yes" This is  
the land and we are the ones to bring reality to our  
dream.

Those pioneers boldly said "Yes" to life... "Yes"  
to nature... "Yes" to America. <sup>and</sup> We today must humbly,  
yet emphatically, also say "Yes" to life...and to its  
challenges. - *This is the spirit of the Democ Party*

We contrast our affirmation of hope to the "No...no..."  
a thousand times no" of the temporary spokesman for the  
Republican Party.

↳ --When we sought to guarantee the basic rights of human dignity under the Constitution, Americans said "Yes" and we passed a civil rights Act.

↳ But Senator Goldwater said "No."

↳ --When we finally achieved an opportunity to end the pouring of radioactive, lethal poison into the air, Americans said "Yes" and we ratified a test ban on ~~atomic~~ nuclear explosions.

↳ But Senator Goldwater said "No."

↳ --When we agreed that a carefully formulated tax cut would provide the necessary stimulus to continuing prosperity, Americans said "Yes" and we passed the tax reduction Act of 1964.

↳ But Senator Goldwater said "No."

--When, in this great land of plenty, we found somber pockets of degradation, of hunger, of hopelessness, Americans said "Yes" to the anti-poverty Act to furnish food and *Educator*

~~clothes and training and jobs...and, above all, hope, to~~  
the poor.

But Senator Goldwater said "No."

< --When we favored strengthening and encouraging ~~and~~  
~~insuring the survival~~ of the United Nations as one of the  
vital hopes for world peace, Americans said "Yes" and we  
approved the bond issue which has kept this organization  
alive.

But Senator Goldwater said "No."

< --When we developed a farm program to help the farmer  
who risks his livelihood against the uncertainties of nature,  
Americans said "Yes" and we passed legislation to protect  
the dedicated, hardworking men and women who have made  
this country the granary of the world.

< But Senator Goldwater said "No."

~~that the~~  
--When we ~~discovered the~~ ~~older citizens~~ in this country,  
through no fault of their own, desperately ~~needed~~ <sup>needed</sup> hospital

When the U.S. Senate passed  
Hospital + Nursing home care

insurance under social security, Americans said "Yes"

~~and we passed the medicare legislation.~~

But Senator Goldwater said "No."

↳ The Republican platform of 1960 ~~specifically favored~~ offered specific proposals

on 25 major issues.

But

↳ Senator Goldwater ~~opposed~~ <sup>had said "NO" to</sup> all 25.

↳ How wrong, how irresponsible, how fearful, can a

candidate for President get? ↳ What do you say to a candidate

with this record of "No," "No," "No."?

↳ Let me tell you: ~~we~~ <sup>we</sup> must say "No... ~~one-hundred~~ <sup>many many</sup>

million times no" to Senator Goldwater on election day.

↳ "No" demands nothing more; it is an end in itself. ↳ But

"Yes" opens up the difficult paths of hard work, of experi-  
mentation, of creativity...and of progress.

↳ Americans believe in the Open Mind. We know that the

mind is like a parachute--it functions best when open.

68 million  
1960  
75 million  
1964

↳ The Open Mind is the society of youth...and those who think young. It is the society of vigor, of challenge, and it says "Yes" to the crucial issues of our times.

↳ The Open Mind proclaims that all things are possible, and this proclamation leads inevitably to the West's vital contribution to our Nation: the spirit of DISCOVERY. (X) *Discovery*

Discovery was the magic of the dream which kept our pioneers moving forward when maps were vague and security was unknown. Discovery...uncharted, unconforming, unproved...was the elixir which kept our great grandfathers plodding one more mile after one more mile. *many miles to walk before sleep.*

↳ We are now embarked on another exciting Age of Discovery...

↳ we are discovering the secrets of the moon, the sun and the stars. We are unlocking the mysteries and the might of the atom. But perhaps our greatest discoveries are not those requiring millions of miles of inter-planetary

travel but those right here on the planet Earth.

We are thrilled by the exploits of our astronauts in outer space. But as Americans we should find equal

satisfaction in exciting achievements in the human sphere--

our recent actions to feed the hungry, to house the dispossessed, and to bind up the wounds of those deprived of the good life by the accident of birth, or the afflictions of old age.

There are those few among us, <sup>the No No men</sup> ~~the newscasters~~, who reject the very thought of Discovery. ~~It shakes them up.~~

It frightens them. It makes them think. It pulls their heads out of the sand.

So They battle against every new Discovery. They are such prisoners of their negativism that they deny the existence of the great things we Americans have already achieved.

For instance, <sup>Sen Haldeman</sup> ~~the temporary spokesman for the Republicans~~ recently accused this Democratic Administration of

creating an "artificial prosperity" for America.

↳ Would you call the weekly wages of 72 million Americans--up 4.8 million from January 1961--artificial?

↳ Would you call the average factory worker's weekly wage of \$103 per week--up from \$89 in January 1961--artificial?

↳ Would you call a gross national product of \$625 billion--up 23 percent from January 1961--artificial?

Would you call the unemployment rate of 4.9% achieved in July 1961--down from 6.7% of January 1961--artificial?

*would you call unprecedented  
Hi Profits, "artificial"*

↳ Would you call the record of price stability--held to 1.2% each year since 1961--artificial?

↳ Would you call the 43 consecutive months--the longest peacetime economic expansion in history--artificial?

↳ The only artificial aspect of this prosperity is the artificial eye glasses through which Senator Goldwater looks at these happy ~~and~~ facts of a ~~growing and~~ ~~prosperous~~ ~~America~~,  
prosperous America.

↳ And what would Senator Goldwater do about changing this "artificially prosperous" land of ours?

↳ Perhaps he would reduce those "artificial" wages so that our "artificially" employed workers would not be able to buy those "artificial cars" so that we wouldn't use so much "artificial steel."

↳ But as for me...and as for most Americans...this prosperity is no illusion. It is real. It is here. ~~we prefer the dream we have achieved to the nightmare offered us by Barry in Blunderland.~~

I believe that the western spirit is best expressed in helping one another: ~~The pooling of resources in the~~

↳ Compassion is not weakness  
and concern for the unfortunate  
is not Socialism —  
It is good Americanism

wagon train...the pitching in to rebuild a neighbor's  
barn burned down...the protection of a widow and her  
children when a young husband dies.

and

The West understands frontiers, old and new, better  
than any other section of our country, For those who  
say we Americans have no more frontiers to cross...for  
those who claim we should stop moving ahead and start  
moving backward...I say this is just some more of Barry's

Need  
frontier

some more of Barry's

~~summit. ~~back~~~~

Wherever in this great land there is a family which  
is ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed, I say there is a  
frontier to be crossed. Wherever there is a bright child  
who cannot afford to attend a school which will further  
stretch his mind, I say there is a frontier to be crossed.  
Wherever there are old people who have been abandoned and  
cannot pay for the good health which will make their

golden years worth living, I say there is a frontier to be crossed. Where there are rat-infested tenements, where there are crime-filled streets, where there are poisoned streams or poisoned minds, I say there are frontiers which the good people in all sections of our country desire to cross.

And cross them we will. For the same spirit which won the West can conquer our new frontiers of waste and disease, of hunger and despair, of futility and fear.

A people which made deserts bloom can make cities sing. A land which has fed the hungry of the world can fire the spirits of the downtrodden. A nation which has planted the seeds of justice in our Bill of Rights can rip out the weeds of injustice from the tracts of racism and reaction.

We are not afraid of the Ku Klux Klan which would put on white sheets to cloak dark purpose; or some Birchites who would put up the noose of calumny for a courageous Chief Justice; or the Minutemen who would raise the sights of their well-oiled rifles against tolerance and brotherly love. We will not abandon sound judgment to the fury of vigilantes.

But we cannot promise easy answers, sugar-coated solutions, and bland assurances in this day of challenge and crises. The problems of our nation and of the world are tremendous, and the answers must come not only from the best and the brightest and the most creative men and women, but they must also come from the collective strength and wisdom of all our people. For we believe in the people. We say "Yes" to the people of this magnificent land.

We do not fear a free press which informs the people. We welcome an enlightened electorate which will make a free choice.

We do not ~~believe~~ <sup>say</sup> that every man is good, but we do believe he is capable of good.

We do not ~~believe~~ <sup>say that</sup> man has already fashioned the Great Society, but we do believe he has caught an unforgettable glimpse of it, and is on his way.

The West was won by vision, by sacrifice, by courage. And as we possess the qualities today, we shall win the future. From the bottom of my heart, I believe with William Faulkner that "man will not merely endure; he will prevail."



# 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](http://www.mnhs.org)