

H.I.T - Amer. Strong

NOTES FOR TAMPA RALLY:

Comm. Facing

1. On November 3rd the American people will

have to make one of the most crucial decisions of this generation. Let no one underestimate the importance of this decision.

Nov 3
Decision

I want to speak with you today about this

decision --- calmly --- factually --- directly --- and honestly.

2. OPPORTUNITY. For the past 30 years, the

American people have supported a variety of policies to broaden opportunity for a better, more productive, happier life for all Americans.

Both political parties -- up to this election -- have supported these policies.

In the areas of education, jobs, health and

alliance for Progress

① Coldwater rules
② Highest they will ever get.
③ Spaghetto
④ Kids - 50¢ an hour & Calhoun says

disease, union rights, agriculture, business, natural resource development, civil rights, and foreign policy, the two parties have supported progressive, forward-looking, enlightened policies to increase opportunities for every American.

Now the Goldwaterites have captured the Republican Party. And they specifically intend to destroy this consensus, tear down these massive economic and social achievements.

How do we know this? We know it because

Senator Goldwater says so:

"The Government must begin to withdraw from a whole series of programs, ---from social welfare programs, education, public power, agriculture, public housing, urban renewal... I do suggest that we establish by

Urban Renewal

Soc Security

law, a rigid time-table for a staged withdrawal."

3. RESPONSIBILITY. / We live in fearful times.

A single miscalculation -- a single rash act -- a single impetuous response --- can destroy the United States and western civilization itself.

The President of the United States is custodian of our nuclear weapons. He, alone, can order their use. He, alone, must decide our response to international crises.

The man in the White House must have the capacity to act with firmness -- yet with restraint. He must not crack under pressure. He must not threaten our friends and enemies. He must not conduct diplomacy by ultimatum.

President Lyndon Johnson has such capacity.

was

What about Senator Goldwater? He has told us where he stands: He rejects foreign aid; he disdains negotiation; he dismisses the United Nations; he condemns our efforts to end the arms race.

Listen to his own words: "A shooting war may cause the death of many millions of people including our own. But we cannot, for that reason, make the avoidance of a shooting war our chief objective."

"We must -- ourselves -- be prepared to undertake military operations against vulnerable Communist regimes."

And remember what happened when the reporter from the German magazine, Der Spiegel, asked him: "But would you go to the brink of war?"

"Yes, " Goldwater replied, "Just as your country

has used brinksmanship down through the years and done so very, very successfully."

One of Goldwater's main goals seems to be "to invite the communist leaders to choose between total destruction of the Soviet Union and accepting local defeat."

These numerous statements -- direct quotes -- illustrate without a doubt that Senator Goldwater is not equipped to control the massive nuclear forces that America possesses.

Radicalism
4. EXTREMISM. There are extremists and radicals in our midst who would divide the country, setting group against group, state against state, section against section.

These men hope desperately to tear down our institutions and to rebuild them to the specifications of their own weird whims and fantasies.

V Manya Nuccio
Sen Smathers

VIVA LB
Samuelson

American Prosperity

Senator Barry Goldwater has become the Radicals ~~tool of these extremists~~. He has permitted them to capture the Republican Party. And he has even complimented their wild and irresponsible behavior in his acceptance speech.

5. LATIN AMERICA. When we survey the

Food for Peace
Peace Corps

history of the past four years, nothing is so striking as the remarkable progress that has been achieved improving relations between the United States and our neighbors to the south.

The world will long remember President John Kennedy for many bold initiations -- but few will be remembered longer than his bold program of hemispheric cooperation -- the Alliance for Progress.

Through the Alliance the peoples of America aim to achieve economic and social justice for all

within a framework of free democratic government.

-The End-

Remarks of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
Lowry Park
Tampa, Florida
October 18, 1964

Senator Humphrey. Thank you. Thank you very much.

Now, my dear friends, my dear friends, don't you cheer so loud. You will make those Goldwaterites feel lonely. (Applause) (Laughter)

But then, on thinking it over, don't be too disturbed about that. They are unhappy anyhow, and I don't think we can do much for them. (Applause)

Senator Smathers, I was awfully sorry that a moment ago, when I saw the signs of one of our distinguished colleagues in the Senate who will undoubtedly go back home after November, when I saw that -- (Applause) -- when I saw that Goldwater sign way up there I was sorry that somebody took it down because that is as high as they are ever going to get. (Applause)

And not only that, not only that. I just found out they were paying those kids only 50 cents an hour. That isn't enough. (Applause)

I want you to know that we Democrats pay a dollar and a quarter an hour. (Applause)

And now all of those young fellows that were carrying the signs that want a dollar and a quarter come up and see us right after the meeting. (Applause)

Did you ever notice that they are always way over there on the far right? (Laughter -- Applause)

And my, am I ever glad to see so many wonderful Democrats right down the middle just as I see them here today. (Applause)

Well, I am just honored beyond words to be here in Tampa, be in this great part of Florida where people have for years shown such wonderful good sense politically.

Oh, you do the right things down here. In 1960 you voted for John Kennedy and in 1964 -- (Applause) -- and in 1964 you are going to vote for Lyndon Johnson, President of the United States. (Applause)

Viva the Democratic Party. (Applause)

Thumbs down on Goldwater. (Applause)

Well now, that took care of him. (Laughter)

Now, ladies and gentlemen, may I just say how pleased Mrs. Humphrey and I are to be welcomed by your community and to have been welcomed by your Mayor and by your city officials, by your business and labor leaders, by your young people, and I want to take just a moment to say a word about my illustrious friend in the Senate, Senator Smathers, and his colleague, Senator Holland who is up for re-election. And believe me one thing we know about our Party. We know that to be a Democrat, you don't always have to do just as somebody tells you to do. We don't drive people from our Party. We bring people into our Party. (Applause)

And we have a President at the head of our country and we have a President at the head of our Party who seeks to unite our people, not divide them. (Applause)

I know that the people in this state are going to re-elect as their United States Senator a gentleman with whom I served in the Senate for many years, Senator Spessard Holland. I know you are going to do that. (Applause)

And I know that there isn't any doubt but what you are going to send back to Congress your own Sam Gibbons because he is on the ball. (Applause)

And my good friends, may I say that you have an opportunity here in Florida, you have an opportunity here in Florida to make all the pollsters and all the political prophets stand up and take notice because day after day I read that possibly Florida might go the wrong way. I don't believe it. I don't believe it. (Applause) (Cries of "no.")

Let me ask you, is Florida going to vote for Johnson and the Democratic Party? (Cries of "yes." -- Applause)

Does Florida want to go back, back, back with Goldwater? (Cries of "no.")

Does Florida want to go ahead with Lyndon? (Cries of "yes.")

Okay. Here we go. (Laughter)

Now, let me just thank the young people that are here. Every place that I go I find hundreds of young people. I am simply delighted. These young people represent the spirit of our Party. They represent the vitality of the Party, the youth of our Administration and Party.

I think many of these young people are going to perform a service on Election Day that is needed in this country as nothing else, and let me ask every boy and girl, every young man and woman in this audience for their attention for one moment.

On November 3rd we have our election. Now, that is not Election Day only. That is Citizenship Day. It is on that day that Americans demonstrate whether or not they really believe in representative government, whether we believe in free government. It is on that day we demonstrate whether or not we are capable of making the right decisions. And I want every boy and girl here, I want you to go home and speak to your mother and your father. I want you to speak to your older sister, 21 years of age and older. And I ask you to ask them to be the guardians of our freedom.

I ask you to make them go to the voting box, the ballot box, on November 3rd and to cast an intelligent vote.

You make it your business this time to advise dad and mom. You make it your business this time to advise your older brother and sister. And you get them to be good Americans. And a good American is a voting American. And a voting American is an American that loves his country. And make every one of them voting Americans. (Applause)

I know you are going to do it, and we depend on you.

President Johnson has asked me to ask you to make this November 3rd the greatest outpouring of votes that America has ever known. Let's do as good as they do other places. I know there are many people here of Italian descent. May I say that in the last election in Italy, 93 percent of the electorate voted. 93 out of 100.

In America, in 1960, 53 out of every 100 voted.

In Venezuela, in Latin America, in the last election, 95 out of every 100 of the Spanish-American people in Venezuela voted. In America, the United States, 63 out of 100.

So, ladies and gentlemen, let's do as good as our friends in Italy. Let's do as good as our friends in Venezuela. Let's vote.

Let's have the biggest vote we ever had in the history of this country on November 3rd. (Applause)

Senator Smathers, you sure keep it hot here. (Laughter)

You know, for a fellow from Minnesota, where the ice is just coming into the lakes, to come down here to Tampa, this is good hot country. Good hot country. And with that hot spaghetti we have got here, we are really going to burn them up today. (Applause)

George was just suggesting that I take off my coat. (Applause)

The only reason I don't do this, all the Goldwaterites get scared when I take off my coat. (Laughter and Applause.) They think we are going to go after them.

I want to tell you something. That is not true. That is not true. I want to let you in on a secret. Maybe you read about it in the paper because truly I sometimes think we get a little out of hand in these campaigns.

Two days ago I was in Sioux Falls, South Dakota. The Senator from Arizona was there also. He was speaking at the Corn Picking Contest, and I was to speak there also. I said the Corn Picking Contest. (Laughter) And while I was at the airport, at the Joe Foss International Field, the Senator from Arizona was coming back from his speech. And I thought it was about time that the American people noticed that we can compete in politics without being personal enemies.

This isn't a matter of being enemies. This is a matter of difference of points of view. This is just a matter of whether or not we can conduct ourselves politically in a manner that is befitting a free people.

So I went over and extended a hand of friendship and fellowship to the Senator from Arizona, and he did the same to me. And I think in every audience that is the way we ought to be.

Now, let me make it clear, crystal clear. I happen to

believe that Senator Goldwater is a patriot. I happen to believe that he is a sociable, fine gentleman. I think he would make a wonderful neighbor, but I sure don't think he would make much of a President. (Applause)

Now, I understand that you had a fellow down here in Miami not long ago. I saw him on the airplane steps there -- looked like he was taking over. I saw a picture of that. He ran for President last time. (Laughter) You heard about him. Well, he is still out, he is still running. (Laughter)

Somebody said they thought he wouldn't make a bad president, but they wouldn't want him for a neighbor. (Laughter)

I am not sure that I feel that way at all. All I know is that we have a man in the White House who will make a good neighbor for you, and he is a good president. So let's keep him. (Applause)

Now, let's not underestimate the importance of this election. This election gets right down to the roots of American public life and public policy.

For 30 years we have been developing in this country a new relationship between the government and the people. Government is a partnership with the people. This is a government designed to serve the people. This is a government of the people and by the people and for the people.

We have developed great programs which have been mentioned here by my friend, Senator Smathers, programs of social security, programs to help the citrus grower with his marketing orders, programs that help the laboring man with collective bargaining, programs that help the businessman with programs of expanding commerce, the Small Business Administration, programs that help our young through education.

Right here at Tampa, Florida, hundreds of thousands of dollars of federal funds come because this is a city with large amounts of federal activities.

I am the author of an act that permits the Federal Government to send sizeable sums of money here to help in the school districts of the State of Florida.

I say that this partnership between your government -- which is your government -- and these great communities is now in jeopardy. I say that these programs that we have talked about, social security, yes, children's school lunch programs, rural electrification, Small Business Administration, one after another, urban renewal, housing, public housing, middle income housing, aid to our colleges and universities, every one of these programs today is on the block in this election.

A decision is going to be made. And people say to me, "Senator, do you really believe that the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party would repeal these programs?" And I say, "All I can do is take him at his word." And what did he say? He said, "I want to be elected not to pass laws but to repeal them." I want to know what laws he is talking about. Does he want to repeal social security? Oh, he says, no, no, no.

Well, he voted against its expansion. He said it ought to be made voluntary. He has expressed real doubt about it.

When we say that he may want to take away the housing programs, he says, "Oh, no." But he voted against them.

He voted against college aid. He voted against scholarships for you young people. He thinks apparently that only those that are well-to-do ought to have a chance to go to college.

He voted against higher education assistance. He voted against National Defense Education Assistance. He hasn't voted for your flood control programs.

This man said the following things, and I quote him from his own words:

"The government must begin to withdraw from a whole series of programs, from social welfare legislation, from education, power, agriculture, housing, urban renewal, and I do suggest that we establish a dateline, a timetable of withdrawal."

Now, ladies and gentlemen, if Mr. Goldwater says that, I have reason to believe he means it, and I say to every mother and father here that wants her boy and girl to go to college, and you have a right to want them to go, you had better watch out how this election comes out because you can't build the colleges and the universities that we need in the days ahead without some help from a Federal Government that has a responsibility to the citizens of every state in this Union. You had better make up your mind -- (Applause) -- you better make up your mind that programs like social security, programs like aid to dependent children, programs that we have worked for 30 years to build, under Republicans and Democrats alike, that they are in jeopardy. That is why this election is a crucial one. This is a man who said -- the man that seeks your votes on the Republican ticket -- this man said, "education is not the responsibility of government. Education is only the responsibility of the parents."

And then he went on to say that some people would be better if they didn't have education.

Ladies and gentlemen, a man that makes a statement like that is no man to put in charge of this country. (Applause)

Here is a man that can't make up his mind whether he is for the United Nations or against it. On one week he says, "I think we ought to get out of the U.N." The next week he says, "I think we ought to support it." Then he says, "I think the U.N. is inadequate." Then he says, "I think it is the best we can get."

Now, what kind of double talk is this?

I don't mind debating with a man that takes a position but to try to find one of these moving targets that is all over the lot -- (Laughter) -- that is just a little bit too much. (Applause)

You know, friends, remember when we used to worry about the

flying saucers? Everybody thought they were seeing flying saucers.

Those weren't flying saucers. Those are just the recent statements of Barry Goldwater. (Applause)

First you hear him and then you don't.

What America needs is a President that means what he says when he says it and says what he means when he says it. (Applause)

And America has that kind of a President. (Applause)

And what America needs as a President is someone who will build and not destroy, someone who will create and not just criticize, someone who will lead us forward and not backwards, someone who will seize the opportunities of the future rather than trying to distort the past. And we have got him and his name is President Lyndon Johnson. (Applause) Now, my friends, let me take just a brief moment of your time on the most important issue of all.

The most important issue facing the American people is the security of this country.

The most important issue facing humanity is peace in this world, not peace with appeasement but peace with honor, not security through making America a garrison state but security by building the great family of free nations into a mighty alliance. And this, my friends, was -- (Applause) -- the goal of John Kennedy in his Atlantic partnership and this is the goal of Lyndon Johnson. (Applause)

But security and peace is more than talk. We have built security through strength. America is stronger today than any nation on the face of the earth. America is more prosperous today than any nation on the face of the earth. America is much more prosperous today than it was four years ago. America is stronger today than it was four years ago.

While the Soviet Union has trouble, we have unprecedented prosperity. While the Soviet Union -- (Applause) -- deposes and throws out Nikita Khrushchev, we march on to re-elect Lyndon Johnson. (Applause)

And, my fellow Americans, don't you let anybody kid you one minute. This country is growing fast. This country is more prosperous than ever.

We intend to build on that prosperity. This country is stronger than ever, and we intend to maintain and sustain and expand that strength. And we build this wealth and we build this power, not just for ourselves. We build it for purposes of a just order, a just world, and a peaceful world.

We have power and we need a President that knows how to use it and how to restrain its use. We don't want power for power's sake. We want power for justice, for freedom and peace. (Applause)

And we don't want anybody in the White House who is playing

war games. (Applause) We want somebody in the White House that is prayerfully day in and day out searching for the paths of peace.

And ladies and gentlemen, we have been doing that. We have been building a better world and we Americans ought to be proud of it.

John Kennedy broke through the Iron Curtain. John Kennedy broke through the Cold War. President John Kennedy, backed up by Lyndon Johnson, is winning the victory for freedom. Let's give him a chance. (Applause)

And that Pan-American airliner reminds me of something. We built the Alliance for Progress while our critics criticized. Today there is a mighty friendship and partnership between the nations south of the Rio Grande and their big neighbors to the north. The Alliance for Progress is no longer a dream. The Alliance for Progress is no longer a speech. The Alliance for Progress is working and millions of people are living better today in the Western Hemisphere because of the Alliance for Progress. (Applause)

We have put our food to work. We are using food for peace. We are feeding and helping to feed 40 million little children in Latin America, 100 million children throughout the world who are sharing in the abundance, the abundance of America's farms. And these 100 million children are being told every day that the people of America, the children of America care about you.

This is an act of friendship that will pay dividends for years to come.

We have sent our Peace Corps abroad. We have sent the flower of our land, the best that we have, to help other people help themselves. 10,000 volunteers, American youth, many of them trained right here in Florida, many right from Florida.

And what does the Senator from Arizona say about the Food for Peace Program. He says no. No food for the hungry. No farm program for the farmers. No food for peace for the world. No, no, no, says the man from Arizona. (Applause)

And what should we say to the man that says no. (Cries of "no.")

Senator Humphrey. No. And we will show him what a "no" means. We will show him how to spell "no." We will show him what "no" means on November 3rd when we vote no against him millions of times. (Applause)

And now, my friends, I have just got to cool off that throat.

The Peace Corps. Every mother and father in America that has a son or daughter in the Peace Corps is proud of it. What did the Senator from Arizona say about the Peace Corps, recommended by John Kennedy and, may I say with some humble pride, I introduced it in the United States Senate, backed by your senators. (Applause)

What did the man from Arizona say about it? Did he vote for it? No. But he called it a haven for beatniks.

Any man that will say that is not qualified to speak for the youth of America, and he ought to be repudiated. (Applause)

So, my friends, we will go on and build. We will build our strength. We will build for peace. We will join the late and beloved, the great spokesman of a mighty Church. We will join Pope John XXIII and we will join John Fitzgerald Kennedy. We will join these apostles of peace in working for an honorable peace through strength and through courage and through courage and through sacrifice. This is the work of a noble and a great people. (Applause)

And I know that we are going to reject this voice of the past. We will reject these children of darkness. We, the American people, are the children of hope, the children of light. We are the hope of the future. We have a great responsibility to ourselves and mankind, and we don't intend to fail in that responsibility.

And therefore, we intend to keep at the helm of this government someone who is tried and tested, someone who is experienced in the arts and sciences of government, someone who understands the world in which we live, someone who dreams of a better America and works for it, one who wants to lead us rather to push us back.

And I ask you to join with me today in showing our President that he will have four more years in the White House, Lyndon Baines Johnson as President of the United States. (Applause)

#####

Remarks of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
SDX Luncheon
International Motel
Tampa, Florida
October 18, 1964

Senator Humphrey. Thank you very much. Thank you very much.

Mr. Brown and Mr. Scroggins and my esteemed colleague in the United States Senate, Senator Smathers, and I believe that we have a couple of good congressmen here with us, Mr. Sam Gibbons and, let me see, who else do we have? And Mr. Haroldson is here, our candidate.

I am going to be very brief in my opening statement to you because I know that the great fun of these conferences is in the question period. It gives everyone a chance for a little workout.

May I first say that it is a joy once again to be in this beautiful State of Florida, one of the fastest growing states of the nation, and a state that grows as rapidly as Florida and a state that is expanding both in terms of population and economy as fast as Florida is a state that ought to vote Democratic because it is the Democratic Party that seems to understand the processes of growth. (Applause)

I have to be very careful in these comments as I travel around the country because every state that I go to seems to feel that it is the best state of all. And of course each of the states can claim a certain amount of that honor. But not long ago I was in a sister state called California, and I had to measure my words very carefully there. Now that I am in the other fast growing state, Florida, I must be sure that I don't do any injustice to California.

So let me just put it this way, that both of these states have demonstrated the kind of vitality, economically, socially, culturally, in terms of population growth and industrial expansion that stands the nation well in the days ahead.

This campaign is a hard working campaign. This campaign is a hard working campaign for both sides.

I recall President Johnson indicating to the Democratic National Committee out at Atlantic City something as to my duties.

Some of you may recall that in my acceptance address I used the phrase "but not Senator Goldwater," so that when President Johnson introduced me and presented me to the Democratic National Committee on the final day of the convention, he said "I want everyone here to take a little rest;" he said, "I want everyone here to get themselves rested up well so that you can enter into this campaign. In other words, enjoy life for a little while. But not Senator Humphrey!" (Laughter)

And it was there I think he said something about that I was to go into 50 states. Well, I am not sure that we will make 50, but we will come mighty close to it, and I can say to you that the reception has been warm, friendly. We understand in

campaigns that people have differences of view. I have been in politics a long time, and an honest disagreement, a difference of point of view, is the very spice and the life of political life, and of political activity. So that doesn't bother me at all. I do think that this campaign is a great deal different, however, than most of them that I have been in, and I think than any other that I have ever been in because it is my sincere conviction that for the first time in this century, there are people of both parties that find themselves unable to accept the candidate of one of the parties. There is a large number of people of sincere Republican persuasion who are traditional Republicans, authentic Republicans, Republicans that have fought the battle for their Party for a quarter of a century or more. Those Republicans by the thousands, in fact, by the millions, are supporting the President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson. And the reason they are doing it is because they have put what they believe to be the interests of their country in terms of national security, of foreign policy, and of sound economic policy, above partisan considerations. (Applause)

Finally I would like to say that it is my view that the ultimate issue in this campaign is the choice between candidates and parties, but in reality the candidates who state the position of their respective organizations or parties, a choice based upon the quality, the qualifications, the experience, the temperament, the attitude and the philosophy of these respective candidates that are the spokesmen for their respective parties in the campaign.

And on the basis of experience, on the basis of proven knowledge of government, on the basis of capacity and ability in the arts and sciences of government, and on the basis of the knowledge of this great Republic and the world of which it is a fundamental and large part, I sincerely believe, and not only partisanly, but believe that President Johnson stands head and shoulders above anyone else, and I am happy to support him. (Applause)

Now, with that, let's have some questions. First question? Yes, sir.

Question. Senator, in your opinion how will the Jenkins' situation affect the campaign?

Senator Humphrey. Well, I believe, sir, that the President of the United States, first Mr. Johnson, made the statement relating to the tragic personal development relating to Mr. Jenkins, and I think that the American people respect that statement.

This is a great personal tragedy, and I think most of us feel it is almost one of those deep tragedies in the family, in the life of a man that leaves little to be said except sorrow and sympathy.

Question. Senator, do you think the change of government in the Soviet Union will somehow redound to the advantage of the Democrats on election day?

Senator Humphrey. Mr. Scherer, I am not at all sure that

anyone can predict that. And I don't think that is the -- of course, the basic issue, even though needless to say in a campaign year one can't help but ask that question and ponder it, I think we ought to clearly understand that the change in government in the Soviet Union does not ease the problems at all that we face and that our allies face internationally.

I think we ought to constantly remember that we are in a continuing struggle with the Communist forces. I think we also ought to remember that we have shown much more stability in this continuing struggle, much more strength, than the Communist forces.

If I could reflect for a moment I would say that the change in the Soviet Union exaggerates, or I should say, emphasizes the uncertainty of the world situation.

I can't see that it eases our problem at all. I would expect that these leaders, these newly appointed leaders, appointed by the Presidium, will make some statements, possibly take some actions, that could be interpreted as being provocative and troublesome.

I do not believe, however, that those actions will precipitate war because the Soviet Union knows the power of the United States of America and her allies.

I would offer this further observation, that the free countries, the democratic countries, have shown remarkable growth, increase in power, and stability, that if -- in a sense this is a vindication of policies that we have pursued. And I want to make it quite clear that the policies that we have pursued have been bipartisan policies up until the recent attack upon those policies by the temporary spokesman of a small fraction of the Republican Party. (Applause) And that is -- I truly didn't intend that to be as partisan as it may have sounded because I am concerned, deeply concerned, as a citizen and as a senator, and as a public official, over this reckless attack, this irresponsible attack upon the fundamental premises of American bipartisan foreign policy.

I think this is one of the more dangerous developments in the United States.

The only difference is here that it won't succeed.

In the Soviet Union, the instability and the irresponsibility has caused very grave difficulties. The Soviet Union is in a deep split with Communist China. This split is not only ideological, it is cultural, political, and racial.

It is in deep trouble economically. And sometimes I feel that the spokesmen for the radical right in the United States propagandize too well for the Soviet Union. They make the Soviet Union look like it is a success.

The Soviet Union's economic structure is at best mediocre and more factually, weak, and in agriculture, and in consumer goods, a grave disappointment to their own people.

Our economic structure is stronger than it has ever been. So is all of Western Europe. So it is not we that are weak. It is they. It is not we that are in grave trouble. It is the

Soviet Bloc with constant pressures in the Eastern European countries to withdraw from the tight grip of Soviet management.

I have a feeling that if we pursue carefully, patiently, and prudently the course of action that we have pursued and don't lose our sense of balance, our sense of perspective, that the struggle, as John Kennedy put it, the long hard struggle, with the Communist forces will be won by the free peoples. (Applause)

Question. Senator --

Senator Humphrey. Yes, sir, Mr. Bailey.

Question. Again on the Jenkins' matter but apart from the personal aspects of it, do you think the case has raised any questions about the adequacy of the security procedures employed by the government?

Senator Humphrey. Well, if it has, Mr. Bailey, that is a matter that will be carefully examined.

I was the author, may I say, in 1956 of the commission to review all the security procedures of the Government of the United States, which commission bill passed the Congress.

I was joined in that by Senator Stennis of Mississippi. I felt that our security provisions then were inadequate, and they had been subject to a good deal of misunderstanding as well as misrepresentation. And yet there were loopholes.

That commission was chaired by the former president of the American Bar Association, Lloyd Wright of Los Angeles, California. That commission's reports did a great deal to strengthen the overall security mechanism of the Government of the United States.

It may be that there needs to be further examination. However, I have heard nothing that indicated any security weakness or any security leak, and I have a feeling that if there had been some weakness or leak, we would have heard about it.

Question. Senator, do you think the explosion of a nuclear device in Communist China will occasion a reconsideration of our non-recognition policy of China?

Senator Humphrey. Well, this surely was not unexpected, and I don't want to say that I have any prophetic vision but as one who has been long interested in the matter of nuclear policy and indeed the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, one of its early advocates, I have said not once but at least 20 times in the Senate of the United States that there is all sorts of evidence that indicated that China, Communist China, would, before -- as I put it -- before 1966, explode a nuclear device, and this last summer I said before 1965 because the physicists that I have talked to indicated that they had the capacity in terms of the knowledge of atomic molecules and the atomic structure to make this discovery and to perfect a device.

So we ought to have been prepared for that.

Secondly, there are those of us that believe that the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty ought to cover Communist China. The President of the United States so said in January. John Kennedy stated so. Dwight Eisenhower stated so. Any responsible American that has been entrusted with the security of this country has advocated that the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty be universal.

We have had difficulties with two countries, Communist China and the Republic of France. I would have a feeling now that the possibility of the inclusion of these two countries has improved primarily because with China getting the device, the French will undoubtedly be more interested in some limitation upon testing, and we ought to bring the pressure of the world community upon Communist China to become a member of that treaty structure.

That does not, however, require recognition. I want to make it clear that we can have treaties with nations or we are a part of a multilateral treaty organization with countries that do not have official recognition by the Government of the United States.

I am not prepared to advocate recognition of Communist China. In fact, I have been a staunch opponent of it, including its membership in the United Nations.

If the Chinese Communists were to show any sense of responsibility, if they were to adhere to treaties that were enforceable, they might be able to demonstrate the kind of responsibility that would merit reconsideration.

But as of now, I must say that they have indicated no willingness to be responsible members of the world community. And I don't believe in giving them any encouragement of respectability in the countries of Asia or Latin America.

Question. Senator, it has been said in some quarters that you were selected as Mr. Johnson's running mate despite the fact that you would be a handicap to the Party in the South. Would you comment, please, sir, on that?

Senator Humphrey. Well, that is a very complimentary reference. (Laughter)

Well, I would like to -- I wish somebody could answer that question for me because for me to state why I think the President selected me might seem a bit egocentric.

I think the President selected me because he knows me, because he knows of my work in the Congress of the United States, because he knows me as an individual, knows my family, knows Mrs. Humphrey, our children. I think I was selected because, as he said, he felt that I had the qualities that were needed for the Vice-Presidential candidate.

I know of no man that doesn't have some limitations, and I surely would be in the list of those that have those limitations.

I imagine in some areas of the country I am not a positive

factor for the President. I would imagine in other areas I might be a very good positive factor.

May I say that I seldom carry all the counties in Southern Minnesota. (Laughter) But may I add that I win by better than 12,000 votes. (Applause)

And I want to say that I have enjoyed campaigning in the South, and I will make a prediction for you. By the time that we have an opportunity to serve one term as Vice-President, I have a feeling that the South and Hubert Humphrey may become country cousins. (Applause)

Thank you.

#####

TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY
BY
SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
DEMOCRATIC VICE PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE
ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA
OCTOBER 18, 1964

In every sense of the phrase, St. Petersburg is an
"All-American City". You have come from every State
in the Union to make your home here in the warmth of
the Florida Sun. When I talk with you I hear the accents
of New England, the Middle West, the Far West, and of
the South.

By sharing diverse backgrounds you understand
more than most Americans how big this country is and how
complex its problems are.

You in St. Petersburg have succeeded in welding
together in community life people of many viewpoints

and people from many regions of America.

↳ Unity has been the springboard of your success
in creating a good life for many older citizens. It has
given focus to your strenuous efforts to broaden the
economic base of St. Petersburg beyond the tourist
business into the industries of the aerospace age.

↳ Your unity of purpose is helping you to preserve
the beauty of the parks, the beaches, and the bays for
which the city is so famous.

These facts -- your local experiences -- enable
you to appreciate what the present administration has
been trying to accomplish for America.

↳ We believe that government can succeed in
servicing America's needs only when it is a government of

*Carl -
Heart*

all of the people -- of people from all states and
regions -- of people of all ages, races, and creeds --
of people of every occupation and business -- of
people who are liberals and people who are conserva-
tives -- of all majorities and all minorities which
accept the ground rules of a Democracy.

I submit that the first choice which you face
this fall is whether or not you want to elect a President
of the United States who agrees with this philosophy.

Do you want a leader who possesses the qualities
to create unity from division, a leader who invites those
who disagree, "Come, ---let us reason together?"

Do you want a leader who believes that our
domestic problems are best solved by a cooperative
partnership and our foreign problems by bipartisanship?

If you do, you have the opportunity -- and the duty -- to vote on November 3 for a man who is this kind of leader -- you have the opportunity to vote for President Lyndon Johnson.

There is another alternative open to you -- you can reject a government of unity and moderation.

There are some extremists and radicals in our midst who would divide the country, setting group against group, state against state, section against section. These men long to tear down our institutions and to rebuild them to the specifications of their own weird whims and fancies.

A hero of these ~~extremists~~ ^{radicals}, Senator Barry Goldwater, is a candidate for the highest office in the land. Only a month ago he came before you here

GOP
Goldwater
not
a Rep

in St. Petersburg with a sample of his divisive and
disruptive viewpoint. His attack that day was on
the Supreme Court; he demanded radical changes in
our constitutional heritage.

↳ If you choose Goldwater in November, you
will be choosing a man who not only boasts about how
he will radically alter our present institutions, but
who brags about his past radicalism.

↳ On some things of very great interest to you
in St. Petersburg, Barry Goldwater has been consistent --
consistently and radically negative.

↳ He has opposed virtually every Federal program
designed to improve life in our cities -- programs developed
by the Kennedy-Johnson administration for better housing,
for mass transit systems, for urban renewal, for open spaces
to be used as parks and recreational areas.

See Sec -

Compassion
concern for
the unfortunate

Senator Goldwater has opposed programs

to help those many Americans who are not reached by
our national prosperity -- whether they are dependent
children, the unemployed, ^{the elderly,} the sick, or the disabled.

~~Yes, Senator Goldwater has sometimes been~~

~~consistent.~~ He has voted in the Senate against every

program created during the Eisenhower, Kennedy, and

Johnson administrations to give more opportunities to

older and younger citizens. The list is long:

~~Goldwater~~ ^{He} has opposed medicare through

social security. When ~~Senator Goldwater~~ asked

in Atlanta where older citizens could find help in

paying their sometimes staggering medical and hospital

bills, his answer was a joke: "I've got my own medicare

plan," he said. "I've got an intern for a son-in-law."

The Republican Spokesman

---~~Goldwater~~ has opposed housing programs
for senior citizens.

He
---~~Goldwater~~ has opposed retraining and
vocational training programs to help older workers
find new jobs.

---~~Goldwater~~, though he now offers a "pie
He
in the sky" proposal for tax reduction, voted against
the Kennedy-Johnson tax reduction which has already
put millions of dollars into the pockets of Florida
citizens.

Senator
---And to top the list, Goldwater would like
to do away with the social security system -- or make
it voluntary -- or "stage a withdrawal" from it, whatever
that may mean.

*Soc
Sec*

[Handwritten scribble]
On November 3 you have the opportunity for

an act of affirmation.

~~It is our conviction that~~ No man is truly
free unless he can live and work in dignity, fearing
~~neither sickness nor old age -- neither man nor~~
machine.

~~It is our conviction that~~ and the business of
government will remain unfinished business so long
as there is a hungry child, a lonely old man, a person
"who never had a chance."

↳ These convictions enable us to envision and
work for what President Johnson has called The Great
Society, an America in which each citizen can realize
his capacities and in which he can enjoy the rewards
of his labor and the sweetness of his leisure.

↳ But more than charity and compassion, or
opportunity and unity, are at stake this November.

The Great Society is possible only if we live in a world at peace.

Since the world entered the nuclear era in 1945, we have lived constantly with the threat that atomic warfare might destroy our civilization either by calculation or error.

One year ago we succeeded in outlawing the atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons as a first step in keeping the world at peace. But we have much more to do if we wish our grandchildren to enjoy The Great Society in a world without war.

I say flatly that Senator Goldwater cannot deal responsibly with this most fearful crisis of our era -- the problem of nuclear power

This is the Presidential candidate who came here

*Nuclear
Tests*

to St. Petersburg one month ago and who -- instead
of discussing how we can live prosperously in a world
at peace -- chose to lecture you about crime and
violence in the streets.

Lawlessness, crime, and moral decay are not
problems in St. Petersburg because you have fulfilled
your local responsibilities well. But you share with
other Americans the responsibility to do what you can
to build a better Nation and a peaceful world.

You can meet that responsibility by choosing
as President the leader who has dedicated all of his
talents and energies to working for freedom and justice
in a peaceful world.

You can choose Lyndon B. Johnson.

-The End-



news release

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

FOR A.M.'S RELEASE
MONDAY, OCTOBER 19

B-3879

TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY
BY
SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY
ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA
OCTOBER 18, 1964

In every sense of the phrase, St. Petersburg is an "All-American city." You have come from every state in the union to make your home here in the warmth of the Florida sun. When I talk with you I hear the accents of New England, the Middle West, the Far West and of the South.

By sharing diverse backgrounds you understand more than most Americans how big this country is and how complex its problems are.

You in St. Petersburg have succeeded in welding together in community life people of many viewpoints and people from many regions of America.

Unity has been the springboard of your success in creating a good life for many older citizens. It has given focus to your strenuous efforts to broaden the economic base of St. Petersburg beyond the tourist business into the industries of the aerospace age.

Your unity of purpose is helping you to preserve the beauty of the parks, the beaches, and the bays for which this city is so famous.

These facts -- your local experience -- enable you to appreciate what the present administration has been trying to accomplish for America.

We believe that government can succeed in serving America's needs only when it is a government of all the people -- of people from all states and regions -- of people of every occupation and business -- of people who are liberals and people who are conservatives -- of all majorities and all minorities which accept the ground rules of a democracy.

- more -

I submit that the first choice which you face this Fall is whether or not you want to elect a President of the United States who agrees with this philosophy.

Do you want a leader who possesses the qualities to create unity from division, a leader who invites those who disagree, "Come --- let us reason together?"

Do you want a leader who believes that our domestic problems are best solved by a cooperative partnership and our foreign problems by bipartisanship?

If you do, you have the opportunity -- and the duty -- to vote on November 3rd for a man who is this kind of leader -- you have the opportunity to vote for President Lyndon Johnson.

There is another alternative open to you, -- you can reject a government of unity and moderation.

There are some extremists and radicals in our midst who would divide the country, setting group against group, state against state, section against section. These men long to tear down our institutions and to rebuild them to the specifications of their own weird whims and fancies.

A hero of these extremists, Senator Barry Goldwater, is a candidate for the highest office in this land. Only a month ago he came before you here in St. Petersburg with a sample of his divisive and disruptive viewpoint. His attack that day was on the Supreme Court; he demanded radical changes in our constitutional heritage.

If you choose Goldwater in November, you will be choosing a man who not only boasts about how he will radically alter our present institutions, but who brags about his past radicalism.

On some things of very great interest to you in St. Petersburg, Barry Goldwater has been consistent -- consistently and radically negative.

He has opened virtually every federal program designed to improve life in our cities -- programs developed by the Kennedy-Johnson Administration for better housing, for mass transit systems,

HUMPHREY/transit systems.

Page 3

for urban renewal, for open spaces to be used as parks and recreational areas.

Senator Goldwater has opposed programs to help these many Americans who are not reached by our national prosperity -- whether they are dependent children, the unemployed, the sick, or the disabled.

Yes, Senator Goldwater has been sometimes consistent. He has voted in the Senate against every program created during the Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson Administrations to give more opportunities to older and younger citizens. The list is long:

--Goldwater has opposed medicare through Social Security.

When Senator Goldwater was asked in Atlanta where older citizens could find help in paying for their sometimes staggering medical and hospital bills, his answer was a joke: "I've got my own medicare plan," he said. "I've got an intern for a son-in-law."

-- Goldwater has opposed housing programs for senior citizens.

--Goldwater has opposed retraining and vocational training programs to help older workers find new jobs.

--Goldwater, though he now offers a "pie in the sky" proposal for tax reduction, voted against the Kennedy-Johnson tax reduction which has already put millions of dollars into the pockets of Florida citizens.

--And to top the list, Goldwater would like to do away with the Social Security system -- or make it voluntary -- or "stage a withdrawal" from it, whatever that may mean.

On November 3rd you have the opportunity to act for an affirmation.

It is our conviction that no man is truly free unless he can live and work in dignity, fearing neither sickness nor old age -- neither man nor machine.

It is our conviction that the business of the government will remain unfinished business so long as there is a hungry child, a lonely old man, a person who "never had a chance."

These convictions enable us to envision and work for what President Johnson has called the Great Society, an America in which

each citizen can realize his capacities and in which he can enjoy the rewards of his labor and the sweetness of his leisure.

But more than charity and compassion, or opportunity and unity, are at stake this November. The Great Society is possible only if we live in a world at peace.

Since the world entered the nuclear era in 1945, we have lived constantly with the threat that atomic warfare might destroy our civilization either by calculation or error.

One year ago we succeeded in outlawing the atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons as a first step in keeping the world at peace. But we have much more to do if we wish our grandchildren to enjoy the Great Society, in a world without war.

I say flatly that Senator Goldwater cannot deal responsibly with this most fearful crisis of our era -- the problem of nuclear war.

This is the Presidential candidate who came here to St. Petersburg one month ago and who -- instead of discussing how we can prosperously in a world at peace -- chose to lecture you about crime and violence in the streets.

Lawlessness, crime, and moral decay are not problems in St. Petersburg because you have fulfilled your local responsibilities well.

But you share with other Americans the responsibility to do what you can to build a better nation and a peaceful world.

You can meet that responsibility by choosing as President the leader who has dedicated all of his talents and energies to working for freedom and justice in a peaceful world.

You can choose Lyndon B. Johnson.

#####

Remarks of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
Williams Park
St. Petersburg, Fla.
October 18, 1964

Senator Humphrey. Thank you very much, Mayor. Thank you very much, Mayor Goldner.

Mayor Goldner, ladies and gentlemen, I am singularly honored today as a visitor from Minnesota and as a candidate for the high office of Vice-President to be welcomed here by one of the gifted, talented and courageous mayors of any city in the United States. (Applause)

I think I know a little bit about some of his problems as a mayor because it was my privilege at one time in my public life, it was my privilege to serve as a mayor of a city in the upper Midwest, the City of Minneapolis, Minnesota. (Applause)

Mr. Mayor, I can think of no job that has more responsibility and at times more troubles but yet more satisfactions than to be the mayor of a great city, and I am sure you feel that way in St. Petersburg. (Applause) So thank you very much.

Now, Mr. Mayor, I think you would be interested to know that only two days ago it was my privilege to be in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, at which meeting I was also privileged to meet an old friend of the United States Senate. Senator Smathers and Senator Holland know that the United States Senate is a rather exclusive club, as it is called. While we have differences of points of view in that body, because we have an aisle that divides us, the Democrats on one side and the Republicans on the other, and even differences within our own Party, while we have those differences, we have learned how to disagree without being disagreeable. (Applause)

So in Sioux Falls I noticed a big jet, and I said to myself, I believe that is the airplane that carries the candidate of the Republican Party, and I was there for a little while at the airport, and I went on over there a little later and had an opportunity to say hello to the gentleman that represents the opposition.

I thought I would mention that because believe it or not, Senator Goldwater and Hubert Humphrey didn't heckle each other. (Applause)

Senator Goldwater and Hubert Humphrey are grown up enough to realize that in this country we have strong views and we have differences of views and we sort of felt it might be a good idea to set an example for our followers of how to be an opponent in an election and still be a gentleman. (Applause) And how to debate the issues without mouthing just empty slogans. (Applause) And I hope, my friends, today that the example that was set by the head of one ticket and the second man on another ticket will prevail in every audience throughout America because Americans deserve a frank and honest discussion of the issues and not a lot of immature, irresponsible chanting by people who don't know what they are talking about. (Applause)

Now, ladies and gentlemen, may I say how privileged -- what a privilege it is to be in this beautiful sunshine city. I have heard so much about it. It is my first visit here, and I am privileged today to be on the platform with a very dear aunt of mine, the aunt that I refer to as Mrs. John Humphrey, Aunt Jo, as we call her, and believe me, it is a wonderful opportunity and honor to be in this same city of her's. She and my uncle John, who was my father's brother, they have been dear to us, to the Humphrey family, and to have her here at a political meeting like this is a pleasure that I hadn't expected.

And I want to say right now that I remember Uncle John so well, and he, too, was of some Republican persuasion, but I think he would have voted for Lyndon B. Johnson. (Applause)

And then, too, may I say how pleased I am to see so many of your local candidates here, because this isn't just an election for President and Vice-President. This is not only an election for the United States Senate here in your state. It isn't just an election for Governor. It is

for school boards, and it is for county officers and local officers, and as one of the fine ladies here on the platform said to me, "Senator, we are talking about an election from the White House to the school house." So let's take good care of it. It is quite a responsibility. (Applause)

I notice, too, that our candidate for Congress on the Democratic ticket is here today, and I want to say what a joy it is to travel with this brief time and to be with this gentleman, and I hope that all of you will give him very serious and thoughtful consideration in this election and I refer to Marion Harrelson who is here on the platform with me. Stand up, Marion. (Applause)

Well, now, let's talk about a little matter that may be of some concern to us, about this nation of ours and about this -- (heckling from audience.)

My dear friends, don't worry about that, there is always a little static on every good program. (Applause)

Very frankly, a good night's sleep and a Democratic victory will take care of all of those problems. (Applause)

Mayor Goldner, I come here to St. Petersburg to salute this all-American city. You have here in this wonderful, beautiful sunshine city of yours people from every part of America. There isn't a state in the Union that isn't represented here in this audience, I am sure. And if ever a senator or a public official had an opportunity to speak to a totally American audience, an all-American audience, Hubert Humphrey has been given that opportunity today, and I want to thank you, Mr. Mayor, for having such a blessed city, such a beautiful place, and one where you can give a senator a chance to talk to people from every area of our nation. (Applause)

And you know what? Just a moment ago a man over here said, "and don't forget there are some here from Minnesota, too." (Applause)

Now, I have examined into what has been the success of this great city because I am sure you know that St. Petersburg has been selected out of all the great cities in America for high honors. Now, this is a tribute to your civic leadership. It is a tribute to the people, and it is a great honor to this state.

This city is not just an all-American city in terms of a statement by a public official. It has been so designated by official bodies and that title, I think, comes from one particular accomplishment. You have here a unity, a unity of purpose and a unity of people, a high regard for people which builds a unity that has been the springboard of your success in creating a good life for your many citizens, and as we know, this great city of St. Petersburg is blessed by having citizens of rich maturity, people who have given so much of their lives to this blessed America of ours.

Many people say these are the older people. I don't say that at all. I just say these are the people that are richer in living and richer in experience and understanding. (Applause)

Your unity of purpose here has helped you to preserve the beauty of your parks, your beaches, and the bays for which this city is so famous, but the real beauty of St. Petersburg is not even in these beaches and parks. The beauty of this city is in the spirit of its people, and it is in this great respect which this community exemplifies for humankind. What is it that differentiates, that divides the free people of the world from the totalitarians? What is it that is the difference between the Communist slave state and the free nation? The basic difference is that in the free nation there is a respect for humankind, a respect for human dignity. Actually may I say on this day of Sabbath that a free people and a democratic people know that basically our democracy has spiritual life and spiritual values. It was God who created man in his own image, and this, the finest creation of Divine Providence, is what we mean by human dignity, the soul and the spirit and the heart and the life of people. And a free society is not dedicated only to parks and playgrounds and jobs. It is not only dedicated to the rich life of material blessings.

A democratic society, a free society, is dedicated to social justice, too, to constant concern over the well-being of the finest of all creation, not the creation of man, but the creation of Providence, and that creation is none other than the heart and the flesh and the blood and the soul and the spirit of each and every one of us.

And the purpose of a free government is to see to it that the lives of these people, our people, we the people -- that those lives are enriched, that they are emancipated, that they are made more blessed, and that they are permitted to fulfill their destiny.

That is what we are really talking about. (Applause)

So here in St. Petersburg as in other cities, too, but so distinctly here, as I said, you have a people from all the states in the regions, people of all ages and of races and creeds, people of every occupation and of every business, people who are liberals and people who are conservatives, people who are of the majorities and of the minorities, but all of them have learned to accept the ground rules of democracy. I trust all have.

And those ground rules of democracy are respect and responsibility, respect for the rights of others and responsibility to one another. Not the unlicensed radicalism, not this business of just selfish pursuit, but respect for one another and responsibility to one another. And a government that is worthy of people of all races, creeds, and nationalities, of every religious faith, any government that is worthy of the respect of these people must be a government that cares. It must be a government with a heart.

This government of ours has been designed to serve the people, not to be served by the people. This is what Abraham Lincoln called a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, and those are not merely words. That is a description of a free government in a great Republic, the United States of America. (Applause)

Now, I say that the first choice which you face this fall is whether or not you wish to elect a President of the United States who sees that government has a responsibility to fulfill towards the communities, towards the individual citizens; in other words, do we want a President that accepts the responsibility of government to the people or do we want a President that says that government is an enemy of the people? One candidate has said, regrettably, and I am sorry that he said it because I think it does him a disservice, one has said that the government in Washington is a greater enemy of freedom than Moscow. This, my friends, is not true, and it is a shameful statement. (Applause)

And, may I add, that those who generally lack the logic of argument are those who generally engage in the noise of the tonsils. (Applause)

Now, may I submit to this audience this question.

Do you want a leader who possesses the qualities in this country of ours to create unity out of division? I think so. A leader who invites those who disagree with him, in the phrase of the prophet Isaiah, "Come, let us reason together"?

Or do you want a leader that promotes disunity rather than creates unity, that drives away from him those who disagree with him rather than reaching out to ask them to come in and reason together.?

Do you want a leader in America who believes that our domestic problems are best solved by a cooperative partnership and relationship between the people and their government and our foreign problems are best solved not as Democrats and not as Republicans but as Americans? If you do -- (Applause) -- if you do want that kind of leadership, you have the opportunity to maintain it and the duty. You have the opportunity and the duty on the day of November 3rd, Election Day, Citizenship Day, to select a man who is just the kind of leader that I have been speaking of, one who does

create unity, one who seeks common goals for the American people, one who senses that a government can be a working partner with every citizen and every community, and one who believes that American security and foreign policy is not the special right of a Democrat or a Republican but belongs to the entire American people, Republicans and Democrats, independents alike, and that leader is the present President of the United States.
(Applause)

Now, my friends, there is, of course, another alternative open because we have been told that this election gives us a choice, and may I say frankly it does give us a choice.

The other alternative -- you can elect a government of unity and of moderation. There are some extremists, and they are few in number, and there are some radicals in our midst who would divide this country, who would set up group against group, state against state, region against region, people against people.

These men long to tear down the institutions that we have built carefully over two centuries and to rebuild these institutions according to their distorted specifications of their own weird whims and fancies.

I say to you that we are not going to let that happen.

I know that in this audience today as the Mayor spoke there are maybe a substantial number, there even may well be a majority of people who traditionally have voted the Republican ticket. I must say to you, my friends, that today we find a substantial share of those voters doing as Mayor Goldner has said; because of love of country, because of concern for the future of America, that are putting their country above their Party.

Now, let me say to these troubled Republicans, to these good souls, let me say, you haven't left your Party. I recognize that in the days ahead many of them will return to support a Republican candidate two or four years from now. You have not left your Party. Let me tell you who has left it.

In 1960 in the Republican Convention a platform was adopted as a result of eight years of leadership on the part of Dwight Eisenhower. A platform that represents responsible actions of a political administration. It was a conservative platform, but it was an authentic Republican platform. It wasn't created out of thin air. It came from the experience of governing America.

There were 25 basic commitments in that platform.

Now, in the Senate of the United States we elect leaders. The leader of the minority is the Senator from Illinois, Mr. Dirksen, a republican. The leader -- the second man in charge in the Republican Party in the Senate is the Senator from California, Mr. Kuchel. The third man is the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Saltonstall. The fourth man is the Senator from Iowa, Mr. Hickenlooper, four of the most distinguished, gifted, able Republican leaders in the Government of the United States.

These men were selected and elected by their own colleagues just as the Senator from Florida, Mr. Smathers, was elected by the Democratic majority to be the Secretary of our -- to be the Secretary of the Democratic Conference, just as I was elected to be the Majority Whip. We must be elected by our colleagues.

Now, what happened in 25 major specific proposals in the Republican Platform of 1960. Senator Dirksen of Illinois -- Senator Kuchel of California, Republican, elected only two years ago with a majority of 800,000 votes in his state, the largest majority any senator ever received in the State of California, a smashing Republican victory, Senator Kuchel voted for his platform 25 times, thoroughly loyal to his Party. Senator Saltonstall of Massachusetts who has been in the Senate for over 20 years voted for his platform 20 times. Senator Dirksen of Illinois, surely he can't be called an extremist or an easterner, two phrases which Mr. Goldwater uses to dismiss those who disagree with him, but Mr. Dirksen voted for his platform 18 times. The Senator from Iowa, Mr. Hickenlooper, conservative Midwestern Republican, voted for his platform 17 times.

There were four of the Republican leaders that voted for their Party. Senator Goldwater of Arizona voted against his platform 25 times.

Who is a Republican? (Applause)

Ladies and gentlemen, it wasn't the Republicans who left their Party. It isn't the New York Herald Tribune that has never before supported a Democrat and this year is supporting President Johnson that has quit the Republican Party. It isn't the Saturday Evening Post published since 1797 and never endorsed a Democrat until now that left its Party. It isn't Life Magazine, the magazine, the magazine publications of Henry Luce and his wife, Clare Booth Luce. It isn't Life Magazine that left the Republican Party when it endorsed President Johnson.

These are Republicans. Mr. Whitney of the New York Herald Tribune is a Republican. He is a rich Republican. He is a strong Republican. He is an authentic Republican. And he endorsed Lyndon Johnson for President. (Applause)

Now, why these millions of Republicans, and there are -- why are the millions of them endorsing and helping Mr. Johnson, President of the United States? I will tell you why, because Senator Goldwater is not a conservative, he is not a Republican; he is a radical and people know it. (Applause)

And why am I saying he is a radical? I am saying he is a radical because the definition of a radical is one who would tear down, who would destroy, who would repudiate, who would violate the traditions and the commitments of the past. And a Presidential candidate that repudiates bipartisan foreign policy, repudiates the United Nations, repudiates his own Party, drives from his own Party people that have long been in it, a man, may I say, who was described by the Governor of Pennsylvania as out of the mainstream of the Republican Party, that sort of a man is a radical. And he ought to be so branded. (Applause)

Ladies and gentlemen, we don't want any radicalism from the Communist left, and we don't want any radicalism from the Goldwaterite right. (Applause)

What America wants America can have. America wants a political leader and a political party and a political performance that goes straight down the highway of social democratic progress for the American people, neither left nor right, but down the pathway of moderation and decency for the American people. (Applause)

Now, why do I make these strong statements? I say that Mr. Goldwater is a radical because he has opposed every federal program designed to improve the life of our communities, programs that are supported, every one of them, overwhelmingly by Republicans and Democrats alike. He has failed to support and opposes programs for better housing, programs for mass transit systems, programs for urban renewal, programs to help our cities, programs for open spaces, programs for recreation.

He voted against the extension and the expansion of social security in 1961. He has made it a practice to vote no on every program of the Kennedy-Johnson Administration and the majority of the programs of the Eisenhower Administration. (Applause)

He has consistently opposed the programs to help those many Americans who are not reached by our national prosperity whether they are dependent children, the unemployed, the elderly, the sick or the disabled. He has voted in the Senate, and I repeat, against every program created during the Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson Administrations to give more opportunities to our older people and to our younger citizens, and the list is long.

Let me read them. He has opposed Medicare. When asked in Atlanta where the older citizens could find help in paying some of their staggering medical and hospital bills, his answer was this. Listen:

"I have got my own medicare plan," he said. "I have got an intern who is a son-in-law." (Applause)

I must say, my friends, I must say that shows very little concern for those of us that don't have sons-in-law who are interns. (Applause)

He has opposed the housing programs for senior citizens. He opposed and voted against retraining and vocational training programs for older workers that were displaced by automation. He voted against the tax reduction, a tax reduction bill recommended by two presidents, supported by the Chamber of Commerce, supported by the AFL-CIO, supported by the National Association of Manufacturers, supported by every state and city in America.

This man voted no when there was a chance to reduce America's taxes by \$11.5 billion. (Applause)

And, ladies and gentlemen, that tax reduction bill which was passed despite Senator Goldwater's opposition and supported by over two-thirds of his own Party, that tax reduction bill has created a prosperity in this country and an economic growth that exceeded the fondest dreams of any of us.

It has been a blessing to the consumer. It has been a blessing to industry. It has forwarded private enterprise, and this man who says that he champions private enterprise voted to put the dagger in its back when he voted against the tax bill that gave private enterprise some help. (Applause)

Now, my friend from Arizona says that we misinterpret his remarks on Social Security. But, ladies and gentlemen, the Senator from Arizona said that he thought Social Security should be voluntary. He said that there ought to be a staged withdrawal on the part of the Federal Government from these social welfare programs. He said, "Ye shall know them by their votes and not by their words."

Well, Senator, I want to call to your attention the vote in May of 1961 when we extended and improved the benefits under Social Security. The Governor from Pennsylvania, Mr. Scranton, was then in the Congress. He voted then as a Republican, aye; the Senator from Arizona, who says he is not a Republican, voted no.

He voted against extra Social Security benefits. He recommends that it be tampered with.

Ladies and gentlemen, Social Security is supported by Democrats and Republicans alike. Social Security belongs to the American people. It is just as much a part of our people today as the Postal Service, and it ought not to be a political football, and we ought to repudiate anyone that makes it a political football. (Applause)

What America needs is a government that cares.

Now, let me say to this fine audience today that those who say that compassion is weakness are wrong, and those who say that concern for the unfortunate, for the needy, for the lame and the halt and the maimed and the elderly, those who say that concern for these unfortunate ones is socialism, he, too, is wrong because compassion and charity and concern for people is good solid Americanism within the traditions of this country. (Applause)

And as your Mayor said, and I conclude on these notes, since the world entered the nuclear era in 1945, we have lived constantly and dangerously with the threat that atomic warfare might destroy everything. And a man that doesn't understand that is unworthy of public trust.

One year ago we succeeded in outlawing the atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons as a first step in keeping the peace, and four out of five of the United States senators, four out of five voted for that treaty. But may I say that one did not. 25 of the 33 Republicans voted yes, but the Senator from Arizona voted no.

I think that we have much more to be concerned with in the days ahead if we wish your grandchildren to enjoy a world without war. And I say flatly to this amazing and wonderful audience that Senator Goldwater cannot deal responsibly with this most fearful and dreadful crisis of our time, the problem of nuclear power, and this is the Presidential candidate that I speak of who came here to St. Petersburg a little over a month ago and instead of discussing with you how we can live better, how we can live prosperously in a world at peace, he chose to lecture you about crime and violence in the streets.

Lawlessness and crime, lawlessness and crime and moral decay are not problems in St. Petersburg because you have fulfilled your local responsibilities and if every city in America would do as well -- (Applause) -- if every city in America would do as well, then indeed this country would be the most law abiding and the most peaceful country in the world.

I am sure you share with me the concern over all of these problems, and I am sure that you share with other Americans the responsibility to do what you can to build a better nation and a peaceful world. You can meet that responsibility and that concern by choosing a President who works for peace and knows that the search for peace is not an act of weakness. It is written in the Scriptures, "blessed are the peacemakers." It is also written that a nation shall perish without vision. And ladies and gentlemen, let me say right now that to search for peace is the task of a giant because peace requires greater power, greater strength, greater moral purpose, than warfare. (Applause) And the President of the United States who occupies 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue is a man who knows that American power and American wealth is not here for luxury or for conquest, that American power and American wealth is here for God's most noble purpose, the search for peace, good will towards men, and that kind of a philosophy requires a nobility of character. It requires a sense of sacrifice. It requires the bravery of a man that is in combat himself.

And I am happy to say that I speak today in St. Petersburg, Florida, for a man who has that strength, who has that nobility of character, who has that wisdom, who has that understanding of the world in which we live. I speak for a man who knows that to search and seek peace is the work of God's children. I speak for a man who fulfills that duty relentlessly and fulfills it well, and his name is President Lyndon Johnson. (Applause)

####

NOTE: THIS SPEECH HAS A READING TIME OF ABOUT 15 MINUTES.

It is the only major speech on problems of older citizens and we wanted the released text to be complete.

It can, of course, be shortened in any number of places if a shorter reading copy is desired. It contains a number of new positive suggestions: e.g., legislation to help build community centers for the elderly, a National Senior Citizens Corps,¹ expanded aging program for National Institutes of Health, and the idea of providing special Federal grants to communities with high percentages of elderly people--much like Federal school aid to impacted areas.

All these ideas have been cleared with Wilbur Cohen. They are largely ~~suggest~~ suggestions for possible action, rather than firm commitments. But they should create some interest.

FOR RELEASE: MONDAY P.M.S
OCTOBER 19

TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY
BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
DEMOCRATIC VICE-PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE, AT MIAMI, FLORIDA

On November 3rd, the American people will decide their future, the future of America, and perhaps the future of all mankind.

I know that you will not be passive at this crucial moment. Our older citizens have an outstanding voting record in presidential elections--fully double the average for younger people. This is indicative of your interest and your concern. It is also a tribute to your knowledge and experience.

Today I want to talk about some of the problems which have occurred in America because of changes in the composition of our population.

Today, we have more older people and more younger people in our population than ever before.

Lyndon Johnson and I do not look upon this as a problem. Rather we look upon our population--young or old--as a vital resource. People, not our material possessions, are the real wealth of America.

We further believe that an opportunity to live self-sufficient and meaningful lives is the prerogative of every citizen. So is the opportunity to contribute to the community life of this country. And we hold ourselves responsible to make these opportunities available to everyone, without regard to race, religion, national origin, sex or age.

We see the scrap heap approach to our older citizens as callous, immoral and incredibly shortsighted.

Thousands of older people throughout America are giving millions of hours of voluntary service to their

communities--they are giving new life and new dimensions to the American tradition of voluntary service in behalf of others.

Today hospitals, libraries, schools, museums, parks, health and welfare departments are providing only limited services because of limited personnel. At the same time, our 20 million retired and older people represent a huge reservoir of skill, talent, experience, and energy seeking useful and constructive outlets. We must capitalize more fully on these priceless resources.

We intend to initiate specific legislative proposals for the establishment of community centers where retired persons can participate in a variety of social activities, educational programs, and programs of community service.

We should also explore the creation of a National Senior Citizens Corps, perhaps as a special component of the Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA), to provide a vehicle for retired citizens to serve as volunteers in developing a wide variety of community services not now available.

At the same time we recognize that older people in our society have special wants and needs.

You are concerned about the level of retirement income and whether it is going to be eroded away by inflation. You are concerned about medical bills which may pile up. You are concerned about comfortable and functional retirement housing at costs and rents you can afford.

From the extensive hearings held in the United States Senate, we know that many fast-buck artists, schemers

and quacks are seeking to exploit these needs.

Senator Goldwater says these are your problems--
and your problems alone. He says these problems are
of no concern to the Federal and State governments.
In a speech before the White House Conference on Aging
in January 1961, Senator Goldwater said that financial
security and other provisions for older people are
responsibilities solely for the individual and his
family.

We reject this position categorically. We believe
that sensible governmental programs can help immeasurably
in making the years of retirement an exciting and fulfilling
period of life.

Perhaps Senator Goldwater needs the chance to learn
by personal experience about the problems of retirees.

So let me suggest that we join together on November 3rd to help provide the retirement from politics he so richly deserves.

This country is enjoying the benefits of the American society you labored diligently to build. We understand this. And we believe you are entitled to share fully in the rewards of your efforts to build a better America.

The Kennedy-Johnson administration has worked consistently toward this objective.

Since 1961, the Congress has increased fourfold the appropriations for the construction of hospitals and centers for diagnosis, treatment and rehabilitation, and geriatric facilities.

In 1961, the Kennedy-Johnson administration and the Congress passed the Community Health Facilities Act.

In 1962, we enacted the welfare amendments to the Social Security Act to establish comprehensive information and referral centers, health clinics, homemaker services, meal delivery to homebound older people, visiting nurse ~~services~~ and other services.

Florida has been one of the principal beneficiaries of these programs. The University of Miami was designated a major center in the United States for research on aging.

In 1962 the Harris-Kefauver drug amendments assured new protection in drug manufacture, tighter inspection requirements, and prohibited the indiscriminate use of dangerous experimental drugs.

In 1963 we passed the mental health act to assist in the construction of community mental health centers and various types of mental retardation centers and to train teachers of the handicapped.

In 1963, we passed legislation to construct new dental, medical, public health and osteopathic facilities and to expand existing ones.

In 1964 we provided funds to modernize and replace antiquated hospitals in many of our metropolitan areas and doubled funds for longterm care facilities.

In 1964 we
~~Congress~~ revised the income tax so that an older couple pays no tax at all until their reportable income exceeds \$3,000. And all--not just part--of expenses for medicines and drugs are deductible from income tax by persons 65 and over.

While Senator Goldwater's remarks about many issues have been cryptic and confused, his voting record is crystal clear. In session after session, he has voted against constructive common-sense proposals to help our older citizens enjoy a more healthy and worthwhile life.

He voted against Federal housing for the elderly on at least four occasions.

He voted against creating the disability insurance program.

He voted against increased federal matching funds for aid to dependent children and to the needy aged, blind and disabled.

He voted twice against medical care for the aged financed through Social Security.

He voted against increased research programs into diseases of the elderly.

He voted against restoration of funds to the Housing and Home Finance Agency research programs on housing for the aged.

He voted against legislation to provide new hospital construction, more medical schools, and more doctors

and nurses.

This record discloses a shocking disregard for the needs and concerns of our older citizens. And it discloses either indifference or ignorance toward the remarkable medical and social breakthroughs which hold such promise for transforming and enriching the lives of our older citizens.

But enough of the past. What of the future?

I predict that the 89th Congress, convening this January, will be remembered as the Congress to establish a common-sense, sound, and long awaited plan for prepaid hospital insurance under social security. In the 88th Congress, the legislation passed the Senate. Next year, I predict, complete victory will be achieved.

The Goldwaterites say that the aged should buy private insurance.

They say that most of the aged are better off financially than younger people, and can easily pay their medical bills. Well, let's try a little experiment. Think of three people you know who are over sixty-five. The odds are that two of them will soon have an annual medical bill of \$1,200. Can they afford it?

You know that "medicare" will not cost your house, or your savings, or your grandson's education. It will cost a small payroll deduction during working years and will take the bite out of those hospital bills when you are trying to live on a fixed retirement income.

And we think this makes sense. We think this is sound public policy.

We intend also to enact increased monthly social security benefit payments. And once we get such monthly payments up to a decent level, we hope to modify the social security benefit structure so that it is responsive to economic changes and fluctuations in the cost of living.

In addition to hospital insurance and increased social security payments, we must continue to build more and better hospitals, nursing homes, geriatric centers, and provide for more doctors, nurses, and other skilled medical personnel.

We must continue to provide assistance for the construction of housing for our older citizens. Since 1961, almost 200,000 dwelling units have been authorized with the aid of public funds. But more must be done.

We must also face up to the unique problems which exist in communities with high concentrations of older people. Why not explore the possibility of providing special assistance to these communities-- just as we provide special assistance to local school systems in areas of high concentrations of Federal employees?

We have just begun to understand fully the nature of these exciting challenges and opportunities. But I can promise you that a Johnson-Humphrey administration will meet these challenges and capitalize on these opportunities.

The most recent medical advances have occurred for the earlier--not the later--years of life.

The principal infant killers have been almost wiped out.

Medical science is discovering the causes of dreaded and congenital defects. Medical science has almost exterminated many of the infectious diseases.

Now we must assault the citadel--degenerative diseases--the chronic diseases of later years. We must provide funds so that the National Institutes of Health can focus their vast resources on this problem. Let us move forward to make the decade of 1965-75 the golden era of medical progress for Americans 65 to 75 and older. This is an objective worthy of a great nation and a great people.

Lyndon Johnson and I ask for your help in this historic effort.

Miami

~~Miami~~ Railroads Brotherhood Meeting - Notes

NO RELEASE

On a day early in May of this year, a small group of men faced each other at a conference table in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Among them were bankers, industrial chieftains, management men from the railroads. They were there to talk about your future.

Forty years ago, this kind of meeting would have meant nothing but trouble for you and your union. Forty years ago, such a meeting might well have meant the drafting of a battle plan for the next skirmish with the Brotherhoods.

But not in 1964. The men who met that day, each an expert in his field, had been brought together by

the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, your union.

They were there not to plot but to plan--in the words of Charles Luna "to explore railroads' future and provide guide lines for its maintenance and development."

To me this conference is a symbol of that which is right in our country today.

We are a nation whose leaders are casting off the narrow shackles and blind prejudices of the past.

--A nation whose leaders look forward to a future in which all Americans will share.

--Not management against labor.

--Not the working man against the privileged class.

--But men together in common pursuit of the goals of their society.

This Cambridge conference, sponsored by your Brotherhood, tells us more than that. It tells us that this is a country in which the working man, through his union, can bring his own voice and his own interests to bear in determining his own future.

This is what Lyndon Johnson has been telling us. This is the way in which the challenge of the great society will be met.

Your union, your industry is not fearful of change.

Anyone who tells you your government wants to dictate your future is not talking about the real world. Your government--this Administration--has helped to create an environment in which your union can function freely.

We, in this country, have truly invented a new kind of government.

--A government which serves rather than dictates.

--A government which stands ready to provide those services which we, as individuals, cannot otherwise obtain.

--A government of compassion and restraint.

This genius of American government has been at work in the transportation policies of the Kennedy-Johnson Administration.

President Kennedy sent to Congress the first Transportation Message in history. He alerted the nation to "pressing problems...burdening our national transportation system, jeopardizing the progress and the security on which we depend."

But President Kennedy knew, as Lyndon Johnson knows, that there is no magic in the expansion of Federal power. "No simple Federal solution," John F. Kennedy told Congress, "can end the problems of any particular company or mode of transportation. On the contrary, I am convinced that less Federal regulation and subsidization is in the long run a prime prerequisite of a healthy intercity transportation network. The constructive efforts of State and local government as well as the transportation industry will also be needed to revitalize our transportation services."

This transportation message was no bill of restraints on the transportation industry, but a bill of rights and freedoms.

OTHER POINTS TO CONSIDER

Urban Mass Transit bill passed--and union rights fully protected.

What about Barry Goldwater? He is a candidate who sponsors legislation to abolish the right of transportation workers to strike instead of devising ways to improve and advance the cause of railroad safety.

He is a candidate who spent the best years of his life stalking the union shop instead of concerning himself with the impact of automation.

He is a candidate who votes with fearful regularity to maintain the conditions which breed poverty and crime instead of devising means to achieve and maintain full employment.

Remarks of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
Florida Forum
Miami, Florida
October 18, 1964

Announcer. WCKT News presents "Florida Forum," an examination of topics of interest to the people of South Florida.

Now here is your moderator, Tom Miller.

Mr. Miller. Good evening.

Our guest tonight on Florida Forum is Senator Humbert Humphrey, Democratic Vice-Presidential nominee, who arrived in our WCKT studios by helicopter from the Miami International Airport a few seconds ago.

Senator Humphrey brings his campaign to Florida today in an effort to return the state to the Democratic fold.

Questioning our guest tonight will be WCKT news commentator Wayne Fariss and Dr. Tom Wood, Chairman of the Department of Government at the University of Miami.

We will also have questions from our studio audience.

Now we will begin with the panel and Wayne Fariss.

Mr. Fariss. Thank you, Tom.

Senator Humphrey, there have been reports late this afternoon that you are planning now to cancel your tomorrow's schedule here in the Miami area, that you plan to make a news conference here in this city shortly after the President addresses the nation tonight.

Is there any truth to the report? If so, would you elaborate?

Senator Humphrey. The President will be addressing the nation tonight, and I believe that following that address we will have to make a decision as to whether or not I can remain here for the projected schedule for tomorrow.

Frankly, I hope I can, but it is very probable that I will have to return to Washington.

Mr. Fariss. There is some doubt, then, that you will not be here tomorrow.

Senator Humphrey. There is as of the moment, but when the President has finished his report to the nation, I will be in touch with him, and I will be able then to determine whether I can stay.

Mr. Fariss. Senator Humphrey, last week on this program Congressman William Miller mentioned that if elected, the Goldwater Administration would support the Cuban refugees giving them ammunition and arms, et cetera. Do you foresee any change in this so far as if the Democratic Administration is elected?

Senator Humphrey. Well, Mr. Fariss, I believe that the policy which we have been following relating to Cuba and to its ultimate freedom is a sound policy. It is not reckless, it is not irresponsible.

Today Castro is weaker. He is much weaker today than he was in 1960. And I would like to add that Castro didn't come to power in Cuba while there was a Democratic Administration in Washington. He came to power in the late 1950's.

The policy that we have been pursuing as one of diplomatic and political isolation and of economic pressure has for the first time brought the Organization of American States to censure the Castro regime, recommend cutting off of all diplomatic relations, and every country of Latin America save one has already done that.

Castro is weak. There has been a change of government in the Soviet Union. I doubt that the Soviets are going to want to pay a million dollars a day to keep this man in power in Cuba. And if we will pursue the course of responsibility, of effective diplomacy, every economic and diplomatic pressure, I do believe that there will be an uprising in Cuba and that the people in Cuba will be able to free themselves from this grip of a temporary dictator. And it is a temporary dictatorship.

Mr. Fariss. Then you don't foresee a change in the Democratic thinking on this.

Senator Humphrey. Not as I can see it now, sir.

However, we are committed to a policy of a free Cuba, and we are also committed to a policy of helping the Cuban people maintain or to have a very good progressive and democratic government.

You know, as I recall, a few years ago, about five years ago, Cuba was the third -- had the third highest per capita income in this hemisphere. Today it is third from the bottom.

The Cuban regime has been a colossal failure.

Mr. Miller. Dr. Tom Wood.

Dr. Wood. Senator Humphrey, you have gotten a good deal of political mileage out of your eight hour interview with Krushchev. Now that there has been a change in leadership in the Kremlin, do you think that your experience and knowledge in terms of our policy towards the USSR is as valuable and pertinent as it was earlier this week?

Senator Humphrey. Well, Dr. Wood, the experience that I had in visiting with Mr. Krushchev was part of a long period of study of Soviet affairs. I have attempted as a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to study Soviet political and economic development and problems.

I don't care to be a specialist in this. There are specialists in our great universities, in our centers of Russian studies, but that experience in talking with Mr. Krushchev was one of many experiences that one has in studying a nation and a political party and a political program.

I think that experience was very valuable. As a matter of fact, I had met both of the men who are presently in the leadership roles in the Soviet Union. And I don't think that you get to know these men very well. They are very subtle and withdrawn.

But I think you can learn a great deal about careful study of Soviet developments.

Dr. Wood. If I may turn to the domestic scene a minute, you are aware, I am sure, Senator, that the people of Dade County have been as much under-represented in the State Legislature as any people in the United States. And we are interested in securing fair apportionment.

What action will the Johnson-Humphrey Administration take, if elected, if the Dirksen bill comes up again before the Congress providing for indefinite postponement of fair apportionment?

Senator Humphrey. Well, it is my view that most of the legislative bodies will have complied with the Supreme Court decision before any action of any kind will be taken in Congress.

Of course, there could be a constitutional amendment, however. But that would then necessitate ratification by 38 states of the Union before it can become effective.

I think that the decision that has been taken by the Court will be effective and, as you know, the Dirksen amendment failed in Congress, failed because those of us that are in positions of leadership felt this amendment went too far, was far too complicated, brought more troubles than it brought relief.

I have no reason to believe that there will be any successful effort in the next Congress.

Dr. Wood. Would the -- excuse me. Would the Administration work against it? That is what I am interested in. If it does come up?

You were aided by time at the end of this last session. If it comes up early in the next legislative session of Congress, would you believe that the Administration would try to block it?

Senator Humphrey. I think the Administration would ask if there was a reasonable time for legislatures to make their reapportionment decisions. We surely would not work against or would not support a proposal to repudiate the decision of the Court.

Mr. Miller. Mr. Fariss.

Mr. Fariss. Senator Humphrey, do you think the events of the past few days, the shake up in the Kremlin and the testing of an atomic device by Red China, will overshadow now in these last two weeks of the campaign the moral issues that will have come up in the campaign?

Do you think that these events I mention now will be in the forefront and be the major talking points, major campaign issues, during these last two weeks?

Senator Humphrey. Well, Mr. Fariss, the most important development that is facing the American people is on the national scene and most people realize that.

I sense as I travel around the United States an issue of -- certain issues on the national scene -- the possibility of war, the hopes of peace.

In other words, the security-peace issue. And surely the developments in the Soviet Union are reason for considerable concern on the part of the American people and the development in China of nuclear power, explosion of a nuclear device, brings a whole new dimension to the aspect of our national security.

In other words, China, Communist China, is on the threshold of being a nuclear power.

I want to make it crystal clear they are not yet a nuclear power because a nuclear device is not a nuclear weapon and the means of delivery are still far off as far as the Chinese are concerned.

But the real basic issues that affect the life of this nation are the issues of our diplomacy, our foreign policy, of national security, and developments in the Soviet Union with the change in leadership must be watched very, very carefully and surely the development of nuclear power in the form of a nuclear device that can lead to a nuclear weapon must really affect the whole thinking of this country and the plans of this great nation of ours in terms of our national security.

So I guess my answer is those are the big issues.

Mr. Fariss. And you will be talking mostly about those, then, in the next two weeks..

Senator Humphrey. I have been concerning myself about these issues as long as I have been in Congress. I was one of those that early predicted the Chinese would have a nuclear device very shortly. I have been watching the developments in the Soviet Union for a long time, and may I say one of the developments in the Soviet Union just recently indicates to me that our policy has been successful.

Mr. Fariss. Well, do you think that there will be a healing of the wounds now between the Kremlin and Peking now that Mr. Krushchev has been turned out to pasture?

Senator Humphrey. Not a bit. I do not. I think the split between the Chinese Communists and the Soviet Russian Communists is an irreparable split.

The difference in ideology is basic. Both of them aspire to be leaders in the Communist areas of the world.

The Chinese feel very superior to the Russians. Those of you that have studied the history of China and the Soviet Union or Russia must realize that -- and do realize that the Chinese have always felt themselves to be a superior people. The Russians have always been fearful of the Chinese. There is a basic racial prejudice -- and I want to underscore this-- a basic racial prejudice in the Soviet Union over the Chinese.

So I think that the split there is deep, and I think it will widen.

In the meantime there is a major battle going on in the Communist camp as to which of the Communist Parties, the Russian Communist Party or the Chinese Communist Party, will have the allegiance of the states in Eastern Europe, of the other Communist Parties around the world, and I think this struggle will continue for many, many years.

In the meantime we have to develop in our country mature understanding of the Communist programs and of the Communist political maneuvers, and this requires study.

You can't do this by just thinking off the top of your head. It requires a development of specialists. It requires patience. It requires above all a degree of forbearance in the use of power and in any statements that we make.

Mr. Miller. Dr. Tom Wood.

Dr. Wood. Senator Humphrey, the Warren Report and the recent Jenkins' incident reveal that our security measures are somewhat short of perfection. What recommendations do you have to insure that the necessary information about security problems gets to the proper officials?

Senator Humphrey. Well, Dr. Wood, I sensed a long time ago that there were some difficulties in any security mechanism in a country as large as this.

In 1956 I introduced into the Congress a resolution to establish a commission on national security. That resolution was adopted. And it was effected, or effectuated.

The head of that commission was Dr. -- was Mr. Loyd Wright, the former president of the American Bar Association.

It examined the entire security mechanism of the Government of the United States.

I am happy to say that many improvements were made there.

Now, we do have about as good a security system as one could really contemplate. There may be room for some improvements but I want to say that every single country in the world, Dr. Wood, has had problems with their security system.

The Russians have lots of problems, and they have the most vicious type of police state. The West Germans that are considered to be very methodical have had serious security problems.

The British have had a number of them. The French have had a number of them. The Dutch, the Norwegians, the Swedes.

I think you remember that Sweden only recently had one of its top officials that was a security problem.

Security is always a difficult matter. I think we have developed about

as fair and yet as effective a security system as any country. It ought constantly to be examined.

But I don't see any security problem, may I say, as yet out of the recent developments. I don't believe this poses a security problem.

I think it has posed a tragic -- personal tragedy. That is the sadness of this whole thing.

Dr. Wood. But the trouble seems to be, Senator, that we have some information that may or may not be noteworthy and it fails to pass from one desk to another, from one office to another, is more proper.

What can be done to insure that this kind of breakdown of communications does not continue?

Senator Humphrey. Well, I guess we have to learn from our experience, Dr. Wood. That is the way most people learn. But I want to repeat again there has been no information that there was any breakdown in the matter of security. I mean, there has been no violation of security.

What has happened is a personal tragedy, a sad tragedy about which most of us are, well, are really grieved and very sad because a man's life is involved and his wife and his family, and yet nothing that we know is affecting the national security.

Mr. Miller. Now we are going to our audience for questions.

Please wait for recognition. Then stand and give your name and organization, if any. Please do not make long statements but, rather, ask questions.

The gentleman in the third row.

Mr. Brown. Burton Brown, Carol City Citizens Organization.

With regard to the Interama Project, I would like to know what the estimates are from the government as to the potential tax revenues as opposed to the outlay of the government funds?

Senator Humphrey. Well, I examined or looked over the proposals for the Interama Project and actually took a helicopter flight over the whole area and met with some of the proponents and the officers of that project.

I regret to tell you that I have forgotten the exact figures but I do know that what we call the cost benefit ratio was very high. In other words, the benefits were several times higher than any costs.

And while I was only a senator from Minnesota, I was keenly interested in the Interama Project because I thought it meant real good things for Florida and for this part of America, and frankly that means a great deal to the whole policy of the United States to Latin America.

I think the political benefits in terms of our international diplomacy are significant. The economic benefits would be several times beyond any cost, and I hope that we will be able to complete it.

You have my support, I want you to know, and I have spoken to the President about it. And I am confident that in our coming budget we will be able to do something about it.

Mr. Miller. About four rows back, the lady in the red dress.

Miss Dermotti. Senator Humphrey, sir, I would like to know why --

Mr. Miller. What is your name, please?

Miss Dermotti. Margaret Dermotti.

I would like to know why the President is so afraid to have a debate

with Senator Goldwater?

Senator Humphrey. Well, my dear lady -- you always get good questions from the ladies.

May I say first of all that I recall Senator Goldwater said -- I believe it was back in February of last year -- that a President of the United States should not debate.

Now, we remember the debates between Mr. Nixon and Mr. Kennedy, but neither of them were president. The President of the United States has responsibilities that go far beyond the cabinet.

Also, I might add that Mr. Goldwater has a few invitations to debate still outstanding, and I have said, and I want to repeat it, and I say it seriously, not facetiously, that if Mr. Goldwater will finish that debate he was supposed to have had with Mr. Rockefeller -- (Laughter -- Applause) -- there was a second invitation to debate with Mr. Romney of Michigan, and the most important debate of all I think was with Mr. Scranton, but -- these were all, I admit, three Republicans that wanted to debate Mr. Goldwater, but those invitations are still outstanding.

And then I might add that since Mr. Goldwater seems to spend a good deal of time telling people of the United States that my middle name is Horatio, how glad I am that I am prepared to take him on for a sort of exhibition bout. (Applause)

Then after that we may match him with the champ. (Applause)

Mr. Miller. The gentleman in the first row.

Mr. Stevenson. Ed Stevenson, President of the Dade County Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO.

Yesterday, Senator, Senator Goldwater campaigning in Mansfield, Ohio, said this: He made reference to one man's thumb being on everything, and he said if this thumb is on collective bargaining, this will be the end of collective bargaining, compulsory arbitration, and this will give you -- he implied, rather, that strikes by labor unions would be out of order entirely.

What are your views on this subject? Do you think this is correct?

Senator Humphrey. My goodness. You know, I never thought I would get a lesson or a lecture from Mr. Goldwater on free collective bargaining. I mean, this is incredible. It is sort of like putting a fox in charge of a chicken coop.

We believe in free collective bargaining. We believe in responsible unionism, I want you to know. And we believe in legitimate trade unions.

Fortunately in our country we have responsible unionism, with very few, if any, exceptions, and we have legitimate trade unions.

The government can never substitute for a free election of the parties. The government can encourage the parties to get together.

We have the Conciliation Service. We have interested parties. Occasionally the President will call in the disputants, the management and the union. but we want these labor disputes, these labor-management disputes, these industrial disputes, settled in the process of collective bargaining, and President Johnson and Hubert Humphrey are committed to a program of solid constructive trade unionism and free collective bargaining.

We are opposed to undue interference by this government in collective bargaining.

We believe that these economic decisions should be made by the parties involved and we obviously will encourage settlement.

The American people want us to. We don't want to encourage fights. We have encouraged settlement in the auto industry. We have encouraged settlement in the steel industry. And frankly, both management and labor have done very well, and this Senator speaks for the President of the United States, and this Administration wants to say that we are proud of the fine record of labor-management relations in this country, and management and labor both are entitled to a good deal of praise and credit for conducting themselves in a manner that is -- in a responsible manner.

Mr. Miller. The gentleman in the fourth row on the end.

Mr. Moore. A. D. Moore, Miami Core.

Senator Humphrey, you knew Barry Goldwater 11 years in the Senate. Do you know of any one single piece of legislation attached to his name or introduced by him during this period? (Laughter -- Applause)

Senator Humphrey. I want to be very frank with you. I don't always mean that a man is ineffective if he doesn't have legislation in his name.

I have been in the Senate 16 years, but I do not recall any legislation that bears the name of the Senator from Arizona, even though he was there when the Republican President was there and when there was, I believe, a Republican majority in the Senate.

He has been very busy campaigning for several years. (Laughter) And that doesn't lend itself to getting legislation passed. I will tell you that.

The only way I know to be an effective senator is to be there. Someone asked me what does it take to make a good effective senator. Well, I said it helps if you are intelligent; it helps if you know what you are doing, but the most important, best way to be effective is just to be there.

If you are not there being a senator, you can't do much, and I think that the Senator from Arizona has been there about 45 percent of the time, absent about 65 percent of the time.

Now, you simply can't make much of a record in the Senate when you are there 45 percent of the time because the other senators are pretty busy, I will tell you.

Mr. Miller. I am sorry. I will have to interrupt. Our time is up.

Our guest tonight has been Senator Hubert Humphrey, Democrat Vice-Presidential nominee.

We thank Senator Humphrey for coming to Miami and making this his first order of business on his Dade County Campaign.

#####

Remarks of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
Miami Press Conference
Miami, Florida
October 18, 1964

Mr. Kassewitz. Senator Humphrey, in view of Red China's explosion of a nuclear weapon, how much longer can the United States oppose Red China's entry into the United Nations?

Mr. McDermott. Senator Humphrey, how serious a political defect do you feel the Walter Jenkins' case will be to the Johnson-Humphrey campaign?

Mr. Bayer. Well, these are two very timely, very topical and very typical questions that will be asked tonight by our professional news panel of the Honorable Hubert Humphrey, Democratic nominee for Vice-President of these United States, currently serving as Senator from the great State of Minnesota.

Senator Humphrey, we appreciate your appearing on Miami Press Conference this evening, and we will get the answers to these questions from John McDermott, Miami Herald, and Jack Kassewitz of the Miami News after this reminder. (Commercial)

Mr. Bayer. We are back to the questions to Senator Hubert Humphrey, Democratic nominee for Vice-President of these United States from John McDermott of the Miami Herald, Jack Kassewitz of the Miami News. John do you want to go back to your original question?

Mr. McDermott. All right.

Senator Humphrey, how serious a political hazard do you feel the Walter Jenkins' case will be to the Johnson-Humphrey campaign?

Senator Humphrey. I believe it is rather difficult to really measure that. My only observation is that it is a personal tragedy. It is a family tragedy. It makes all of us that have known Mr. Jenkins very sad and sorrowful.

I believe that Mrs. Johnson and President Johnson express the thoughts of millions of Americans in their messages of understanding and of sympathy and of concern.

I don't think one can measure the political consequences.

Mr. McDermott. Have you been able to determine whether there was a breakdown in security either on the part of the FBI or on the part of the Secret Service in the Jenkins' case?

Senator Humphrey. No, sir. As you know, the President did ask the Federal Bureau of Investigation to check into this thing immediately. But I doubt that there has been. However, we will have to await the full report of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Back in 1956 I introduced a resolution in the Senate which was subsequently adopted by both the Senate and the House to establish a National Commission on Security, examining into our whole security structure.

Senator Stennis of Mississippi joined me in this. The Commission was established and the former president of the American Bar Association, Mr. Loyd Wright of Los Angeles, was the chairman of that Commission.

We think we made some rather substantial improvements in the security structure. But I want to be frank with you, sir. I do not believe that any country has a totally perfect security structure. We try to improve it.

But even the Soviet Union with its police state has leaks in security. Germany, Britain, France, others have had. Sweden.

As yet, however, we have had no indication of any breach of security in the United States in this matter.

Mr. McDermott. Senator Humphrey, last night in Fort Lauderdale former

Vice-President Nixon said that he felt that President Johnson should, when he speaks on nation-wide television tonight, include also a background disclosure of what he knows about both the Jenkins' case and the Bobby Baker case. Do you feel that these cases should be part of the political campaign?

Senator Humphrey. Well, sir, I would have expected Mr. Nixon to say that. This is within the pattern of his public conduct.

The respective cases that you have referred to are being carefully examined. Mr. Baker is under scrutiny and investigation by the Treasury Department, the Justice Department, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Senate. I imagine he is even being scrutinized by Mr. Nixon if that is any help to anybody.

And the Jenkins' matter is now under the investigation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. And I hope I won't seem to be too unkind or partisan if I say that I would rather rely on J. Edgar Hoover than Richard Nixon.

Mr. Bayer. All right. Jack?

Mr. Kassewitz. Senator Humphrey, changing the subject just for a moment, with the President speaking on television tonight, Red China having exploded a nuclear weapon this week and Mr. Khrushchev having been deposed, you made a statement in Tampa today that you expect the Soviet Union to make -- take some action that could be considered provocative.

Now, is the President going to discuss some new phase in the world crisis that has not yet been disclosed to this nation?

Senator Humphrey. What I tried to say -- and, of course, this is always the danger of a sentence being taken from a larger statement or possibly it is the danger of a man making any comments at all -- I have tried to be a student of Soviet developments because I happen to believe that our relationships with the Soviet Union now and in the years to come are of crucial importance.

Too many people speak about the Soviet Union without knowing anything about its geography, its history, its background, its tradition, or the history of the Communist Party or the changes in the Communist Party.

There is new leadership now in the Soviet Union, and new leadership in a dictatorship generally starts to make a few -- generally has a few new starts, so to speak.

I mean, they make statements that indicate that they are cleansing themselves of the past and being a little more tough relating to the potential enemies.

What I was trying to say is that you could expect possibly for some weeks ahead statements that were irritating, actions that were of concern to us, but I said I did not expect the Soviet leaders to do anything that would trigger a major war or struggle or any hostilities.

I just happen to feel that these Soviet leaders as they are now attacking Mr. Khrushchev will most likely have some unkind words to say about the United States, and what we ought to do is just take this in stride.

It is the Soviet Union, Mr. Kassewitz, that is in trouble. It is the Soviet leadership that is in trouble. It is the Communist Party that is in trouble.

We are not in serious trouble. We are stronger than we have ever been. We are richer than we have ever been. Our policies are succeeding, their policies are failing.

Mr. Bayer. Senator, wouldn't this be a good time perhaps to try to encourage the Cuban exiles to take guns and go back and get their homeland back from Mr. Castro and his Red cohorts?

Senator Humphrey. Well, I may be too conservative for some people. I don't believe that that type of radical adventure is the kind we ought to even consider.

I happen to believe that our policies relating to Cuba are very -- are succeeding. The Organization of American States has taken unprecedented action of asking all of the nations of the Western Hemisphere to break diplomatic relations and economic relations with Cuba, and all but one have done so. This is historic.

Mr. Castro is in trouble. His benefactor, his sponsor, is out of power in the Soviet Union. The Russians are having plenty of trouble, and a million dollars a day for Cuba may be a little bit more of an expense than they want to pay for that fellow Mr. Castro.

I think if we pursue the course we have been pursuing of patience, perseverance, economic and diplomatic, upon Mr. Castro's regime, that within Cuba itself there will be an uprising, and I think that uprising will take place and that the Cuban people will be freed and they will be freed by the people within Cuba themselves.

Mr. Kassewitz. Senator, let me go back to this Red China for a couple of more moments. You have consistently opposed the entry of Red China into the United Nations as has been the policy of the United States Government.

Senator Humphrey. Yes.

Mr. Kassewitz. Secretary Rusk said today that any treaty banning nuclear tests now may have to include Communist China.

Senator Humphrey. Yes, sir.

Mr. Kassewitz. Is this going to mean in your opinion that we are going to have a complete review of the China policy, and will we perhaps finally allow Red China to be admitted to the United Nations?

Senator Humphrey. It should be very clear to the American people that a treaty with Red China does not necessarily require diplomatic recognition.

Furthermore, it does not require their entrance into the United Nations or their acceptance into the United Nations.

We already have been in discussions with China in Warsaw for many months, in fact, years, starting back in the Eisenhower Administration. Those discussions have related to Korea; they have related to Viet-Nam. They have related to all the areas of Southeast Asia.

I hope that we will be able to -- the pressure of the world community to bring Red China as a signatory to the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty -- and I hope that our ally, France, will sign that treaty so that we can set a pattern here and break through because these are the only two countries to date that have any nuclear capability that are not members of the -- not participants in the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

Mr. Kassewitz. Suppose you put -- they would put a condition of signing the treaty on the provision they get admitted to the United Nations. Would you go along with that?

Senator Humphrey. Well, I think those are matters that would have to be reviewed more carefully than two minutes of a discussion on a television show, sir.

I think we have to be very, very responsible and careful in our foreign policy, and I don't believe that you can judge the matters quickly. We have to weigh off all of these things.

As I see it now, I would say that you cannot really ask, permit Red China to come into the United Nations because she has been an aggressive power, and she has been a very difficult nation in terms of our relationships to Southeast Asia.

Mr. McDermott. Senator, how did you feel that you could get the other

nations of the world to bring the pressure which you had mentioned onto Red China to get them to sign the Nuclear Test Ban?

Senator Humphrey. Well, very frankly most of the nations of the world are very concerned over nuclear testing, and that is why over 100 nations have signed the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

Most of the nations of the world are worried about China's aggressive attitudes, and I would imagine that the best thing that we could do through the diplomatic channels that we have, we and the Russians and the British and the others, is to seek to have the foreign offices of these respective 100 countries to urge upon the Chinese Government that they become a participant to the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, a signatory to the treaty.

Now, whether that will be successful or not, sir, I can't predict. I would say offhand it would look like it wouldn't be, but a mobilization of world opinion is still a powerful factor in international relations. And I believe that the best thing that happened in the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty was the fact that 100 nations came to a common point of agreement as to the dangers involved in further nuclear testing in the atmosphere.

Mr. McDermott. Senator, at Fort Lauderdale last night your old friend, the former Vice-President, Mr. Nixon, said that he wanted in all fairness to you to say that Hubert is a loyal American, that he is for peace, that he is a sincere man, and that he is a dedicated radical.

Now, my thought was on this do you consider yourself to be a radical in politics?

Senator Humphrey. Well, let me say that Mr. Nixon had a pretty good batting average there. He was right about three-fourths of the time. They fired Yogi Berra for much less than that, you know. (Laughter)

I consider myself according to the description of Mr. Nixon to be a patriot and to be a loyal American, to be sincere, and I believe he said honest. I would like to feel that I am that.

As to the other part, he must have become a little confused because Mr. Goldwater is the radical. Mr. Goldwater is the man that has repudiated bipartisan foreign policy.

He is the man that has left the Republican Party. On 25 issues in the Republican Platform of 1960 Mr. Goldwater voted against his platform 25 times.

He is the man that seems to have been out of the mainstream of American political life according to Governor Scranton of Pennsylvania. And any man that is so far out that he can't agree on foreign policy and domestic policy and can't agree with his own Party, I would have to say is a radical.

Now, as far as Senator Humphrey is concerned, I am a Democrat. I agree with President Johnson. I believe in the free enterprise system. I support the bipartisan foreign policy.

I consider myself to be what Sen Rayburn once said, a Democrat without prefix or suffix and without apology. And I hope a good citizen.

Mr. Bayer. Gentlemen, let's pause just a moment. Time out for this reminder, please. (Commercial)

Mr. Bayer. We are back with the questions to the Honorable Hubert Humphrey, Democratic nominee for Vice-President of these United States, and the question is from Jack Kassewitz, Miami News. Jack, you were --

Mr. Kassewitz. Yes. I was going to say Senator Goldwater has charged that President Johnson and yourself and the Administration are soft on Communism. Do you have an answer to that?

Senator Humphrey. Well, I remember when Mr. Goldwater made that charge, and I recall that he said that he had been advised to do that by Mr. Nixon.

I am sorry that he accepted that advice because that led Mr. Nixon to political oblivion.

Then he said also that he hadn't repeated it for a couple of days and somebody asked him, "Well, why don't you use that charge again, Mr. Goldwater?" He said, "I thought I would just wait and see what the reaction is."

Now, that seems rather cynical.

I would say this about President Johnson. Any man that has known the President knows that this is a patriot second to none. His work in the Congress as chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee, as Majority Leader, as Vice-President -- my goodness, I don't know anybody in the world in their right mind that would talk about President Johnson being soft on Communism.

Now, he is a little soft on Republicans once in a while, but I kind of think that is all right. They are good Americans, and I think he ought to be. And some folks have even criticized him a little bit about that, but that is the only softness that I detected in the President.

Mr. Kassewitz. One more Republican charge that was made in this show, as it has been made elsewhere, Congressman Miller, your Vice-Presidential rival, said that this Administration has a "no win" policy in Viet-Nam and says that the Republicans will have a "win" policy. What is the United States' policy in Viet-Nam?

Senator Humphrey. Well, sir, it is the policy that was established in 1954 under Dwight Eisenhower, reiterated in 1957, again in 1959, and again in 1960, and '61.

I select these dates because in each of those years there were new developments in Viet-Nam where the United States at the request of the South Viet-Nameese Government came in to be of some help to that government to preserve its territorial integrity and its independence.

Now, the gentleman from New York knows better than that but he needs to say something.

Mr. Lodge was our Ambassador there. And Mr. Lodge I think has made it quite clear to the American people that the policy that we pursue in Viet-Nam is not a Democratic policy. It is not a Republican policy. It is an American policy. And that policy is under constant review.

What we are trying to do is to see to it that South Viet-Nam remains independent and free without the involvement of the United States in a major war in Southeast Asia.

Now, if Mr. Miller means that this "win" policy that he is talking about is to plunge this nation into war with Red China, then let him explain that to the American people.

The President of the United States, Mr. Johnson, and Hubert Humphrey do not want to plunge this nation into a major war with Red China or with anybody else. The task of statesmanship today is to preserve the peace and to secure the independence and freedom of peoples. And if we have the patience and the perseverance, sir, and I think we have as a people and a nation, we will win with this policy.

There is no instant victory. There is only instant annihilation. And we are not for annihilation. We are for life. And we are for a program dedicated to peace and as President Johnson -- as the late beloved President Kennedy said, "Peace is a process."

It isn't instantaneous. Peace requires great sacrifice, and it requires courage, and it requires great responsibility. And all these glib phrases about instant victory and no win and all that, that doesn't represent statesmanship.

Mr. McDermott. Senator Humphrey, some of the real conservatives in Florida and other parts of the South talk about you as though you were a man with horns.

Could you explain what your political philosophy is and also include your connection with the ADA because that is very much of a campaign issue down in these parts?

Senator Humphrey. Well, you know, I answered a question today about this, and I even indicated that in Minnesota I have had sometimes a little trouble in the southern counties of our State, but I get elected with about a 200,000 majority.

My political philosophy is one that this government is designed to serve the people. It is not designed to dominate the people. It is designed to remove impediments to progress, to open pathways of opportunities. It is also a government that should care and have compassion. This is a government of the people and by the people and for the people.

I have never felt that compassion was weakness. And I have never felt that concern for the unfortunate was socialism. I think it is really very good Americanism.

There is a great history in this country of concern for people. I believe strongly in the free enterprise system. I am an advocate of it. I am a part of it. My family is a part of it.

I voted for the tax reduction bill to help free enterprise, for the investment tax credit to help free enterprise, for the Small Business Administration to help free enterprise. I have never believed that an organized, planned socialistic structure had any place in the American scene. I believe very strongly in the rights of people.

I guess my main trouble has been in the South that I have taken a strong position in reference to constitutional guarantees for all of our citizens. But you know what I find? I find that most people in America respect you if you have principle and while many people may not agree with you because of your point of view, they will respect you.

Might I say that my position, for example, on the issue of equal rights for all Americans regardless of race, color or creed, is one that has been traditional in the history of this country from Jefferson to Lincoln to Wilson to Roosevelt to Eisenhower to Kennedy. This is not unusual.

Now, we are making great social changes now, and it is difficult. I am sympathetic with people who have a time adjusting to this. But Hubert Humphrey's position in Minnesota is the same as it is in Florida, and it is the same in Texas as it is in New York. I don't have one pamphlet for the District of Columbia and another one for Georgia.

And I regret to say that the gentleman of the opposition has a pamphlet in the District of Columbia that says "Barry Goldwater, the Champion of Civil Rights." And he whistles "Dixie" when he gets below the Mason-Dixon Line.

I am of the opinion that he is about as good for Dixie as Sherman was.
(Laughter)

I think these southerners are going to find that out. I can't recall yet what the Republican Party has ever done for the South. I can recall what they have done to it, but I don't know of any time they have been helpful, and I will put my record up as a friend of the South against the current Republican leadership.

Mr. Bayer. Senator, one thing that might be a little closer to home and some people might be interested in it is the space race, and, of course, Cape Kennedy is right in our back yard.

Senator Humphrey. Yes, sir.

Mr. Bayer. If the Johnson-Humphrey team wins, will you have some thoughts about speeding up our efforts to get up with our friends across the way?

Senator Humphrey. Yes, sir. President Johnson when he was in the Senate was the chief motivator and mover on the space program as you know. He was the chairman of the Space and Aeronautics Commission -- Committee.

When he became Vice-President under law he is the chairman of the board, so to speak, of the National Aeronautics and Space Agency. If I am elected Vice-President, and President Johnson is elected President -- that comes with it -- I will be the chairman of that board.

I have vigorously supported the expansion of our space activities in the Committee on Appropriations and as the floor leader in the United States Senate, and may I say to the good people of Florida that they will have our unqualified support and development of this great program, not just for Florida but for America, because truly the frontiers are in the areas of outer space.

We must pioneer in this area. We must pioneer for our military security. We must pioneer in space for peaceful purposes.

And you can rest assured, sir, that this Administration, the Johnson-Humphrey Administration, will place priority, chief, main emphasis upon the expansion of our space and aeronautics activities.

Mr. Kassewitz. Senator, two questions in one, I hope. Will the Democrats carry Florida, and how many states in the South do you think you are going to lose because of your civil rights position?

Senator Humphrey. We surely expect to carry Florida because the --

Mr. Kassewitz. Well, they haven't done it the last three times.

Senator Humphrey. Well, of course, but everybody is entitled to a few mistakes. It is time to redeem yourself, and we expect that this state will go for the Democratic team.

President Johnson is a southerner. I can't imagine the southerners turning their backs on the first President from the South in a hundred years.

We broke through the religious barrier in 1960 so that a man no longer is denied the opportunity to be President because of his religion. Now we have broken through the sectional barrier, the regional barrier, and I have a feeling that before this election campaign is through, the southerners will be the most vigorous supporters of President Johnson.

Whoever is President of the United States, sir, must enforce the Civil Rights law.

Mr. McDermott. But you have only got two weeks, Senator. So what states would you consider are either lost or where you are trailing now?

Senator Humphrey. Well, I am such a positive thinker it is difficult for me to think of those.

Mr. Kassewitz. Mississippi for one.

Senator Humphrey. I would say there may be two states right now that look difficult, that would not be in the Democratic column, and they might not like me to say that. But Alabama -- we do not have electors on the ballot, and Mississippi.

There may be some difficulty. Some people say in Louisiana, but I think we will carry Louisiana.

I feel that the South will again be a strong force for Democratic victory. Georgia has never voted Republican in a hundred years and neither has Arkansas. I have been in both states. They are going to go Democratic. And may I add that Minnesota will be right at the top of the list.

Mr. McDermott. What about Arizona?

Senator Humphrey. We expect to carry Arizona.

Mr. Kassewitz. South Carolina.

Senator Humphrey. Oh, of course.

Mr. Kassewitz. Senator Strom Thurmond's home state?

Senator Humphrey. Well, and also Governor Don Russell's and not only that -- when the people of South Carolina find out what the Senator from Arizona has not done for them -- they have to eat, too, you know. And they raise cotton. And they have industry. And the Senator from South Carolina -- the Senator from Arizona is not going to get by with this double play of talking as if he is a great states righter south of the Mason-Dixon Line and then going up to Hershey, Pennsylvania, and meeting with Dwight Eisenhower and saying "Look, I am all for your program, General."

You have to come -- you really have to take a stand, and the people of the South respect, I think, integrity. I think they respect intellectual integrity, and they know that the Federal Government has been more helpful to this area than almost any area in the United States, and it should be so.

The South is the new South. This is a whole new chapter in American life. And I think that the greatest development in America will come in the South, and if that is the case, they are going to need progressive leadership and prudent leadership.

We are going to offer it to them.

Mr. Bayer. Senator, you obviously are confident that you are going to win without any question. Then who would you say is going to emerge some 38 or 39 months away? You have always been a great "looker-ahead." That has been your record. Who do you look ahead and see as being the people in the Republican Party that you will be looking to, say about 39 or 40 months from now?

Senator Humphrey. Well, sir, it is my sincere view that the Goldwater crowd has more or less usurped control of the Republican Party. They did it through legal instruments. I don't want that to be misunderstood. They outorganized the rest of the Republicans.

But the Rockefeller Republicans and the Scranton Republicans and the Romney Republicans and the Dewey Republicans, and the Eisenhower Republicans, and others, they are not going to let this go by the boards.

What do you think Mr. Nixon is campaigning for? Mr. Goldwater? He is campaigning for Mr. Nixon. And so is Mr. Scranton. They are out just working the precincts left and right, and I bet you every time you find their coat pockets they have got 40 names inside of new people they have just contacted.

They are planning on after the debacle, after the complete defeat of the Goldwater campaign, they are planning on coming back and trying to put the Party together, and I hope they do.

Let me be very frank with you. I think America needs a responsible two-party system. I don't think America needs radicalism in the Democratic Party or the Republican Party.

There was once a time that there was some radical penetration tried in the Democratic Party. It was rebuked. It went off to the Progressive Party in 1946.

Now you have the radicalism of the extreme right penetrating the Republican Party. That must be rebuked.

We don't need the radicalism of the left and we don't need the radicalism of the right, and I do hope that some of these good responsible Republicans will reclaim their Party.

I think they will. And it will be a real honest political contest the next election around.

Mr. Kassewitz. Are you going to accept any of these Democrats back into the Party, those who have defected and announced their support of Mr. Goldwater?

Senator Humphrey. Oh, I have always believed in repentance if it is sincere, but I want to be sure they are sincere.

Mr. Bayer. Senator, when will you be able to know whether or not all your plans are canceled for tomorrow? Many of the people watching us tonight would like to know do you know here now?

Senator Humphrey. I would presume I will have to go to Washington tomorrow, but I will know definitely tonight about 10:00 o'clock.

Mr. Bayer. Thank you.

I want to thank Senator Hubert Humphrey, Democratic nominee for Vice-President of these United States. This has been the only legitimate press panel program to invite him in Florida, and we appreciate your appearance. For Jack Kassewitz of the Miami News and John McDermott of the Miami Herald this is Bill Bayer saying good night and to you, sir, good luck.

Senator Humphrey. Thank you, sir.

#####



news release

10

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

FOR PM'S RELEASE
MONDAY, OCTOBER 19

B-3880

TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY

BY

SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY
MIAMI BEACH, FLORIDA
SENIOR CITIZENS MEETING
OCTOBER 19, 1964

On November 3rd the American people will decide their future, the future of America, and perhaps the future of all mankind.

I know that you will not be passive at this crucial moment. Our older citizens have an outstanding voting record in presidential elections -- fully double the average for younger people. This is indicative of your interest and your concern. It is also a tribute to your knowledge and experience.

Today I want to talk about some of the problems which have occurred in America because of changes in the composition of our population.

Today, we have more older people and more younger people in our population than ever before.

Lyndon Johnson and I do not look upon this as a problem. Rather we look upon our population -- young or old -- as a vital resource. People, not our material possessions, are the real wealth of America.

We further believe that an opportunity to live self-sufficient and meaningful lives is the prerogative of every citizen. So is the opportunity to contribute to the community life of this country. And we hold ourselves responsible to make these opportunities available to everyone, without regard to race, religion, national origin, sex or age.

We see the scrap heap approach to our older citizens as callous, immoral and incredibly shortsighted.

Thousands of older people throughout America are giving millions of hours of voluntary service to their communities -- they are giving new life and new dimensions to the American tradition of voluntary service in behalf of others.

We intend to initiate specific legislative proposals for the establishment of community centers where retired persons can participate in a variety of social activities, educational programs, and programs of community service.

We intend also to ask the Congress to explore the creation of a National Senior Citizens Corps, perhaps as special component of the Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA), to provide a vehicle for retired citizens to serve as volunteers in developing a wide variety of community services not now available.

Today hospitals, libraries, schools, museums, parks, health and welfare departments are providing only limited services because of limited personnel. At the same time, our 20 million retired and older people represent a huge reservoir of skill, talent, experience, and energy seeking useful and constructive outlets. We must capitalize more fully on these priceless resources.

At the same time we recognize that older people in our society have special wants and needs.

You are concerned about the level of retirement income and whether it is going to be eroded away by inflation. You are concerned about medical bills which may pile up. You are concerned about comfortable and functional retirement housing at costs and rents you can afford.

From the extensive hearings held in the United States Senate, we know that many fast-buck artists, schemers and quacks are seeking to exploit these needs.

Senator Goldwater says these are your problems -- and your problems alone. He says these problems are of no concern to the Federal and State governments. In a speech before the White House Conference on Aging in January 1961, Senator Goldwater said that financial security and other provisions for older people are responsibilities solely for the individual and his family.

We reject this position categorically. We believe that sensible governmental programs can help immeasurably in making the years of retirement an exciting and fulfilling period of life.

Perhaps Senator Goldwater needs the chance to learn by personal experience about the problems of retirees. So let me suggest that we join together on November 3rd to help provide the retirement from politics he so richly deserves.

This country is enjoying the benefits of the American society you labored diligently to build. We understand this. And we believe you are entitled to share fully in the rewards of your efforts to build a better America.

The Kennedy-Johnson administration has worked consistently toward this objective.

Since 1961, the Congress has increased fourfold the appropriations for the construction of hospitals and centers for diagnosis, treatment and rehabilitation, and geriatric facilities.

In 1961, the Kennedy-Johnson administration and the Congress passed the Community Health Facilities Act.

In 1962, we enacted the welfare amendments to the Social Security Act to establish comprehensive information and referral centers, health clinics, home-maker services, meal delivery to homebound older people, visiting nurse and other services.

Florida has been one of the principal beneficiaries of these programs. The University of Miami was designated a major center in the United States for research on aging.

In 1962 the Harris-Kefauver drug amendments assured new protection in drug manufacture, tighter inspection requirements, and prohibited the indiscriminate use of dangerous experimental drugs.

In 1963 we passed the mental health act to assist in the construction of community mental health centers and various types of mental retardation centers and to train teachers of the handicapped.

In 1963, we passed legislation to construct new dental, medical, public health and osteopathic facilities and to expand existing ones.

In 1964 we provided funds to modernize and replace antiquated hospitals in many of our metropolitan areas and doubled funds for long-term care facilities.

We revised the income tax so that an older couple pays no tax at all until their reportable income exceeds \$3,000. And all -- not just part -- of expenses for medicines and drugs are deductible from income tax by persons 65 and over.

While Senator Goldwater's remarks about many issues have been cryptic and confused, his voting record is crystal clear. In session after session, he has voted against constructive common-sense proposals to help our older citizens enjoy a more healthy and worthwhile life.

He voted against Federal housing for the elderly on at least four occasions.

He voted against creating the disability insurance program.

He voted against increased federal matching funds for aid to dependent children and to the needy aged, blind and disabled.

He voted twice against medical care for the aged financed through Social Security.

He voted against increased research programs into diseases of the elderly.

He voted against restoration of funds to the Housing and Home Finance Agency research programs on housing for the aged.

He voted against legislation to provide new hospital construction, more medical schools, and more doctors and nurses.

This record discloses a shocking disregard for the needs and concerns of our older citizens. And it discloses either indifference or ignorance toward the remarkable medical and social breakthroughs which hold such promise for transforming and enriching the lives of our older citizens.

But enough of the past. What of the future?

I predict that the 89th Congress, convening this January, will be remembered as the Congress to establish a common-sense, sound, and long awaited plan for prepaid hospital insurance under social security. In the 88th Congress, the legislation passed the Senate. Next year, I predict, complete victory will be achieved.

The Goldwaterites say that the aged should buy private insurance.

They say that most of the aged are better off financially than younger people, and can easily pay their medical bills. Well, let's try a little experiment. Think of three people you know who are over sixty-five. The odds are that two of them will soon have an annual medical bill of \$1,200. Can they afford it?

You know that "medicare" will not cost your house, or your savings, or your grandson's education. It will cost a small payroll deduction during working years and will take the bite out of those hospital bills when you are trying to live on a fixed retirement income.

And we think this makes sense. We think this is sound public policy.

We intend also to enact increased monthly social security benefit payments. And once we get such monthly payments up to a decent level, we hope to modify the social security benefit structure so that it is responsive to economic changes and fluctuations in the cost of living.

In addition to hospital insurance and increased social security payments, we must continue to build more and better hospitals, nursing homes, geriatric centers, and provide for more doctors, nurses, and other skilled medical personnel.

We must continue to provide assistance for the construction of housing for our older citizens. Since 1961, almost 200,000 dwelling units have been authorized with the aid of public funds. But more must be done.

We must also face up to the unique problems which exist in communities -- just as we provide special assistance to local school systems in areas of high concentrations of Federal employees?

We have just begun to understand fully the nature of these exciting challenges and opportunities. But I can promise you that a Johnson-Humphrey administration will meet these challenges and capitalize on these opportunities.

The most recent medical advances have occurred for the earlier -- not the later -- years of life. The principal infant killers have been almost wiped out. Medical science is discovering the causes of dreaded and congenital defects. Medical science has almost exterminated many of the infectious diseases.

Now we must assault the citadel -- degenerative diseases -- the chronic diseases of later years. We must provide funds so that the National Institutes of Health can focus their vast resources on this problem. Let us move forward to make the decade of 1965-75 the golden era of medical progress for Americans 65 to 75 and older. This is an objective worthy of a great nation and a great people.

Lyndon Johnson and I ask for your help in this historic effort.

#

Remarks
Address of

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey

University of Miami

October 19, 1964

PROGRESS IN THE HEMISPHERE

When we survey the history of the past four years, nothing is so striking as the remarkable progress that has been achieved improving relations between the U.S. and our neighbors to the South. The world will long remember John F. Kennedy for many bold initiatives -- but few will be remembered longer than his efforts to strengthen the solidarity between the nations of this hemisphere. Few will be remembered longer than the program of hemispheric cooperation which he launched -- the Alliance for Progress. Through the Alliance for Progress the peoples of America aim to achieve economic and social justice for all within a framework of free democratic government.

Here in Miami it is appropriate to ^{note} ~~consider~~ the

decline in influence of a tyrant who once posed a serious threat to the stability of our hemisphere -- Cuban Premier Fidel Castro.

Let me just take you back a moment to the day four years ago when the American people went to the polls to elect the Kennedy-Johnson ticket. I wonder how many of you can recall just what the outlook was for peace in this hemisphere on that fateful day.

On that November election day in 1960, Fidel Castro was nearing the end of his second year of power. And he was riding high. After confiscating more than a billion dollars worth of U.S. property, he had transformed that island into the first communist state in the Western hemisphere.

Yes, Mr. Castro was a confident man in those days. And I remember magazine articles which spoke of his dream of turning Latin America into a third world center of communist power, rivaling the hegemonies of Russia

and China. That seems almost comic today, but I don't remember much laughter back in 1960.

And I remember too that one of Castro's lieutenants, Major Che Guevara, was boasting that the entire range of the Andes Mountains, running the entire length of Latin America, would soon become a new Sierra Maestra, the mountains from which Castro conquered Cuba. Nobody laughed.

Oh, yes, there was great confidence in Havana in those days, and in Moscow as well. But outside of Cuba -- in Washington and in every Latin American capital -- there was disarray and confusion -- in some places even panic. Men were afraid and they sought an answer to their fears. But when they looked to Washington they were eyeball to eyeball with a Republican Party that had no bold or creative answers -- a Party that was confused and vacillating.

Now how about Fidel Castro today. Well, I think we can say that those confident communist days of 1960 have gone forever, thanks to the resolute action of President John F. Kennedy in the Cuban missile crisis. The dreams of glory, the call to revolutionary arms, have gone. Those Russian missiles have gone. And Castro's influence in the hemisphere is gone.

I want to remind you that everywhere in Latin America four years ago the menace of Castroism and communism lay across the land like a plague. There were few public leaders in those days who even dared criticize him. But only two months ago the ambassadors of the Organization of American States voted overwhelmingly to bring sanctions against the Castro regime, to break relations, to halt trade and even communication. And around the hemisphere the forces

of Castroism have been defeated. They have been defeated in Venezuela in December 1963, when President Leoni won the Venezuela elections, succeeding the first President in Venezuelan history to serve out a full term in office. They were defeated in Brazil where Castro Communist infiltration failed to take over the Brazilian government. They were decisively defeated in September of this year in Chile where my friend Senator Eduardo Frei and his Christian Democratic Party triumphed in the presidential election over the Communist Socialist candidate, Salvador Allende.

It is clear that Castroism is on the wane, that his influence has been curtailed, that hemispheric solidarity has been strengthened through the Alliance for Progress.

"We know that Castroism is not the wave of the future. We have taken action to make certain that it is not. The tide of the future is against Castro, not with him.

{ Oct. 1953 }
[Miami]

Senior Citizen Talk

While Senator Goldwater's remarks about many issues have been cryptic and confused, his voting record on problems of our senior citizens is crystal clear. In session after session, he has voted against constructive common-sense proposals to help our older citizens enjoy a more healthy and worthwhile life.

He voted against federal housing for the elderly on at least four occasions.

He voted against creating the disability insurance program.

He voted against increased federal matching funds for aid to dependent children and to the needy aged, blind and disabled.

He voted twice against medical care for the aged financed through social security.

He voted against increased research programs into diseases of the elderly.

He voted against restoration of funds to the Housing and Home Finance Agency Research programs on housing for the aged.

He voted against legislation to provide new hospital construction, more medical schools, and more doctors and nurses.

This record discloses a shocking disregard for the needs and concerns of our older citizens. And it discloses either indifference or ignorance toward the remarkable medical and social breakthroughs which hold such promise for transforming the lives of our older citizens.

But enough of the past. What of the future?

I predict that the 89th Congress, convening this January, will be remembered as the Congress to establish a common-sense, sound, and long awaited plan for prepaid hospital insurance under social security. In the 88th Congress, the legislation passed the Senate. Next year, I predict, complete victory will be achieved.

The Goldwaterites say that the aged should buy private insurance.

They say that most of the aged are better off financially than younger people, and can easily pay their medical bills. Well, let's try a little experiment. Think of three people you know who are over sixty-five. The odds are that two of them will soon have an annual medical bill of \$1,200. Can they afford it?

You know that "medicare" will not cost your home,
or your savings, or your grandson's education. It will
cost a small payroll deduction during working years
and will take the bite out of those hospital bills
when you are trying to live on a fixed retirement
income.

And we think this makes sense. We think this is
sound public policy.

We intend also to enact increased monthly social
security payments. And once we get such monthly payments
up to a decent level, we hope to modify the social security
benefit structure so that it is responsive to economic
changes and fluctuations in the cost of living.



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