

SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY

Green & Shopping Center
Saturday, October 24
Detroit, Michigan

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Thank you very much, Governor Swainson.

My good friends from the State of Michigan, our fellow Democrats, fellow citizens, I hope you will forgive us for pushing this program along, but you have been waiting for some time and we have a very tight schedule today, a number of meetings in this great metropolitan area of this marvelous state, this beautiful, enterprising State of Michigan, and then down to Lacrosse, Wisconsin. Then, tonight I go to visit my hometown of Minneapolis, Minnesota, where we have our traditional Democratic Bean Feast, which means that we elect a Democratic President every time we have one of those Democratic Bean Feasts. (Applause.)

I come here today with good heart and good cheer and good enthusiasm. I come here today to say to you that the people of Michigan have a glorious opportunity awaiting them on November 3rd, an opportunity to return to the United States Senate one of its most talented and gifted sons, a man that has earned the respect and the admiration, not only of his Democratic colleagues in the Senate, but of those in the opposition of the Republican ranks. I haven't the slightest doubt but what the people of this great state are going to return to the United States Senate their United States Senator, Philip Hart, for another term. (Applause.)

And, Phil, I'm looking forward to the opportunity of sitting up there in that presiding officer's chair and saying, "The Chair recognizes the Senator from Michigan." Stand up there, Phil. (Applause.)

Then, on November 3rd, you have yet another great opportunity. You have the opportunity to see to it that here in the State of Michigan you have in the Governor's office one that will work with and cooperate with the national Democratic administration. You have a friend here, a friend of this state, highly regarded and respected, in Michigan, in Washington, throughout the nation. He has done as much or more for the building of this party in Michigan than any man that I know and I haven't the slightest doubt but what when the votes are counted on that election day of November 3rd that the next governor of the State of Michigan will be Neil Staebler. (Applause.)

And might I add that with all of these fine men, we need Democratic Congressmen. We need them in every district that we can get from this great state. We need them from Billy Farnum in the 19th. We need Frank Sierawski in the 18th, and we need that fine lady that has done so much for your state and your area and for our country, Martha Griffiths from the 17th. (Applause.)

And I'm sure you know that we want to see this Democratic ticket backed right down the line. We are now at a point in the campaign where the American people must make two decisions on two fundamental issues. Both of those decisions will decide who will be the next President of the United States.

Let me say the first decision is whether or not we are going to continue to build on the platform of progress that we have developed these last 30 years of economic and social progress for every American, for progress for our workers, progress for our farmers, progress for our businessmen, progress for our needy and our elderly, progress for our youth through education.

For 30 years, the American people have hammered out a program of social and economic progress that, in the main outline, has been accepted by both political parties. But now, there rises a man who is but a temporary spokesman of a small fraction of a faction of reaction in the Republican party, a man who repudiates that great 30 years of progress, who would veto it and who has said

Green 6 - page 2

so quite candidly.

Let me make it quite clear. Mr. Goldwater does not deceive you. I admire him for his candor. I have said a number of times that I know this man and know him well. I am not here to cast any aspersions upon him as an individual and as a person.

As a matter of fact, I will be very frank with you. I think he would make a fine neighbor, but I think he would make a poor President. (Applause.)

Mr. Goldwater tells us frankly that he wants to get the government out of the programs of social welfare, of agriculture, of labor standards, of urban renewal, of housing, of education. He means it, and if that's what you want, you should vote for him.

But if you want to continue down the lines of social and economic progress started with Roosevelt, Franklin Roosevelt, carried on by Truman, forwarded under Eisenhower, and then advanced further under John Kennedy, and now under the leadership of President Johnson -- if you want to keep that, vote for President Johnson. (Applause.)

Then, might I add this, the second issue. The second issue is whether or not the American people wish to repudiate the standards and the basis of our bipartisan foreign policy which is designed for our security and for the peace of the world. We have patiently constructed this policy over many years, and right here in this state, a great statesman of the opposition party, of the legitimate opposition party, Arthur Vandenberg, helped build that foreign policy.

He worked with Harry Truman and Harry Truman worked with him, just exactly as Lyndon Johnson worked with Dwight Eisenhower and Dwight Eisenhower worked with him, and just exactly, may I add, as men like Senator Saltonstall of Massachusetts have worked with John Kennedy, and others, like Senator Aiken of Vermont, have worked with President Johnson.

We have built together, not as Republicans, not as Democrats, but as Americans. We have created a great bulwark of freedom, a great foreign policy, a program of national security and national strength. We have constructed alliances.

Today, we celebrate United Nations' Day. We have strengthened the United Nations. We support the United Nations. This is a part of the general security structure of this land. Yet, my fellow Americans, there stands before us, seeking the high office of President, someone who repudiates it all, someone who says "no more bipartisanship", someone who says "no United Nations", someone who says we ought to get out of the United Nations.

That man is the temporary spokesman of the Republican party. Now, if you want to destroy our alliances, if you want to repudiate our foreign policy, if you want to put America alone in the world against all others, if you want to weaken the United Nations, if you want to see it scrapped, you can do it and you can make that decision. Because I will say that Senator Goldwater has given us a choice.

He is frank and he is honest. He has said this is your choice. If you want that, vote for Senator Goldwater.

But, if you want to strengthen the U. N., if you want to work for peace, if you want to see the Peace Corps advance, the food for peace program made even more effective, if you want to see some curbing of the arms race, if you want to continue the nuclear test ban treaty, if you want to build our alliances and our strength, if you want to sustain the policy of this country for peace and progress, I say weigh: this carefully and I say to

Green 8 - page 3

this audience -- young and old alike -- you'd better vote for the Democratic nominee. You had better vote for President Johnson -- and I might add, for Hubert Humphrey, too.

Now, I leave you with this word. November 3rd is election day, but more importantly, it is citizenship day. It's a day -- may I have the attention of our young friends for a moment? Every boy and girl in this audience, this day is your day and maybe, in many ways, it ought to be dedicated to the children of America, because on that day, we are going to determine whether you have a future or not. We are going to determine the issues of peace and war, of progress and reaction. And I ask every boy and girl in this audience to be a committee of one, a sentinel, a guardian of Democracy.

In fact, I commission you from this platform in your home to see to it that your mother and your father and your brother or your sister, age 21 or over, any relative or friend that you have, any member of your family, you young people here prove to the world and to America that you love your country even as much or more than your adult seniors. Prove it by seeing to it that mother and dad vote; prove it by seeing to it that America turns out an overwhelming vote on election day. (Applause.)

Now, my friends, we must go on to the next meeting. I leave you and thank you so much for coming to us. Help us November 3rd. Help Lyndon Johnson, Neil Staebler; help Philip Hart, and the Democratic ticket.

- end -

SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY

Taylorstown Shopping Center
Detroit, Michigan
Saturday, October 24

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I gather that there is a real spirit here from the Henry Ford Community College, is that right? (Applause.)

I thank the young folks here of the band of Taylorstown Center. We thank you very, very much. I understand that you won your home-coming game, is that right? (Applause.)

Well, now, you know, I'm in very bad shape today because the University of Michigan is playing the University of Minnesota, and the half-time score was 10 to zero for Michigan. (Applause.)

I thought you'd also like to know that Michigan State is winning over Northwestern. The half-time score was 17 to nothing.

But, then, I think you would like to know that the full-time score on November 3rd is going to be an overwhelming Democratic victory. (Applause.)

And that doesn't mean just a victory for our President. It means a victory for your Congressman here, your candidate for Congress, Bill Ford, who is going to win. (Applause.)

And I might add, since I'm close to it, it means a victory for John Dingle over in the 6th District, too. (Applause.)

Mr. Canfield, I'm so very pleased to be here in your District and I'm delighted that I have the opportunity to complete your day of campaigning here in Michigan right here in Taylorstown. It's a wonderful day that we have had. I have been traveling today with our good friend, your United States Senator -- whom you are going to re-elect -- Philip Hart. (Applause.)

I have also had the good fortune once again to be on the campaign trail with the gentleman that I know is going to be the next Governor of the State of Michigan, and that's your own Neil Staebler. (Applause.)

And just as you are going to elect a governor, may I suggest you elect a Democratic lieutenant-governor, Bob Derengowski, who is on our ballot, too.

Just go right down the line and elect that Democratic ticket.

I want to pay tribute to the Sisters from Saint Pascal's Parish, who I notice are here. (Applause.)

I want to let our young people know how much we appreciate their attendance and their presence in these meetings. I noticed -- I heard a voice out there, way back -- far, far back -- that indicated that this poor soul is still carrying one of those banners of the candidate of the past, the candidate of Never-Never Land. I want all my young friends here to be charitable to these people. Just be charitable to them because they only come here for one purpose. They come here only to repent for their political inequities. (Applause.)

Now, ladies and gentlemen, may I just suggest that when they suggest that "We want Barry", we never know whether it's straw-Barry or rasp-Barry. And these poor souls don't know that Barry-picking time is over by November 3rd. (Applause.)

It's a great day, isn't it? Don't you like this day? (Applause.)

How many people here feel like Democrats? Say aye. (Applause.) How many people feel sick and tired? Say "Goldwater". (Goldwater.)

Well, I just thought I would test you out. The reason I did that is every time we hear the candidate of the opposition, he says, "We're sick and tired."

Now, that's the sentiment of many of our visitors here. In the line of our...

(Applause.)

Now, just a few moments of serious visiting with you. We are in one of the newer communities of this great growing State of Michigan. These communities have many, many opportunities ahead, and indeed, many challenges. And I can think of no area of America that needs closer cooperation with government and the people than those communities that are what we might say growing, that are on the upward surge -- new homes, new businesses, new schools. I think the choice that we have before us these next few days is one of whether or not we want to have an America that moves ahead, that meets the challenges of tomorrow, or whether we wish to have an American and a government in this country that looks backwards and fails to appreciate the opportunities of today and tomorrow.

We have some very serious decisions to make. Every election campaign is filled with a certain amount of tumult and every election is filled with a certain amount of pointing with pride and viewing with alarm. But I do think that after we settle down and quit chanting the nonsense and start to think about the real problems and the real challenges, then we understand how terribly important it is that we make a sensible decision on November 3rd.
(Applause.)

The two great issues before us, or questions, are first, do we want to continue the progress that we have made over these 30 years, or do we want to turn back the clock and revert back to a day when government showed little or no interest in the people and there was no real partnership in the people, with the people, when there was no real effort made to coordinate the great institutions of our government for public betterment.

I believe that the issue is do we want to build the social and economic progress that this country has demonstrated since the days of the great depression? That social and economic progress has been supported not just by the Democratic party, but it has been supported by the wise and the sensible leadership of the Republican party.

We now have, however, a candidate on the Republican ticket who repudiates that progress, who would turn it back, who says that he does not feel that the government of your nation -- you see, that's what's wrong with their party right there. (Applause.)

You know, every time that party boos like that, we gain another thousand votes. (Applause.)

The American people don't like people with bad manners or booing. They like nice people, happy people.

Well, now that we have gotten rid of the boo-ers, we'll go down now for the cheer-ers. (Applause.)

The American people want to see this country grow and expand. The American people want to see their government fulfil its legitimate role in that process of growth and expansion.

The American people believed from the time of Abraham Lincoln -- yes, from the time of the inception of this Republic -- that there is a responsibility of the Federal government and the state government to education, that there is a responsibility to help make our economy a stronger and a better economy.

I can say to this audience without any fear of successful contradiction that in the last four years, this economy has grown more rapidly and there are more jobs and greater prosperity and greater profits and better wages than any time in the history of the American Republic, and we ought to keep those gains, not lose them. (Applause.)

Ladies and gentl men, as important as the issues are of economic growth, as important as the issues are of social security and education, all of these matters take a secondary importance to the matter of our security, to the matter of peace in this world.

Taylorstown - 3

And as we view the world situation today, we can't help but be concerned about the days ahead. And I believe that it's fair to say that the strength of America is not the result of either a Democrat or a Republican, but rather the result of a collective effort between Democrats and Republicans.

We have built a great bipartisan foreign policy. We have had men of both political parties that have helped build the strength of this nation's military. We have had men of both political parties that have supported the United Nations, and today is United Nations Day, and the United Nations is an instrument of strength and of peace for the people that want a peaceful world. (Applause.)

It was this great bipartisanship that had the support of the late Senator Arthur Vandenburg, of this state, of President Harry Truman, of President Dwight Eisenhower, of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy -- (Applause.)

And now has the support of President Lyndon Johnson. (Applause.)

We want to make sure that this great citadel of bipartisanship in support of American security and American foreign policy is not lost. And yet, the candidate on the opposition ticket -- who does not really represent the majority of his party -- that candidate today repudiates the United Nations, repudiates bipartisanship, repudiates every bit of the structure of national bipartisanship that has built our foreign policy.

So, the question before Americans on November 3rd is do you want to build on the solid foundation of 30 years of social and economic progress? If you do, you will vote for Lyndon Johnson as President of the United States. (Applause.)

The second question is do you want to continue and to build upon that solid rock of bipartisanship in for ign policy and national security? If you do, you will vote for Lyndon Johnson as President of the United States. (Applause.)

And if you want to see that Michigan works with the nation, if you want to make sure that Michigan makes its contribution to this great effort of a better America and a more peaceful world, you will re-elect Philip Hart to the United States Senate. (Applause.)

And you will send Bill Ford to the Congress of the United States. You will send John Dingell to the Congress of the United States. (Applause.)

And you will see to it that you make as Governor of this state one who can work with a Democratic Administration, one who will work with President Johnson and a Democratic Congress, Neil Staebler. (Applause.)

- end -

Address by

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey

Detroit, Michigan

October 23, 1964

The events of recent days--the shake-up in the Kremlin leadership, the detonation of a nuclear device by Communist China, the change in government in Great Britain, remind us once again of the highly changeable nature of the world in which we live.

The events which occurred in the Communist world remind us once again of the delicate balance of world peace. Such events impress upon us once again the need for responsibility in the exercise of Presidential power. Fortunately, we have a President who has the wisdom to understand these international changes, a President with the skill and vision necessary to preserve world peace.

Of prime importance in preserving this delicate balance of peace is the maintenance in this country of the bipartisan tradition in foreign policy. The tradition followed by four Presidents--Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson. Under this tradition, both political parties have given their support to the Marshall Plan, to NATO, to the United Nations, to the foreign aid program, to the Alliance for Progress, and to creative programs like the Peace Corps and Food for Peace. They have supported attempts to build bridges of hope to the oppressed people of the Communist nations, and attempts to reach realistic agreements to tame the atom before it maims us.

During the past four years we have consistently acted in accordance with these bipartisan guidelines. What are the results of our conduct of foreign policy for the past four years? I will

briefly sketch out the broad outlines:

...We have greatly widened the gap between U.S. and Soviet strategic military power.

...We have responded with power, restraint and precision to each Communist probe of our will and intentions -- in Cuba, in Berlin, in Vietnam and in the Gulf of Tonkin.

...We have vastly widened the massive economic superiority of the U.S. and the Western world over the Communist world.

...We have diminished the danger of nuclear war through misunderstanding by the establishment of the hot line between Washington and Moscow.

...We have taken the first step in history toward the control of nuclear weapons and the end of atmospheric poisoning through achieving the test-ban treaty.

...We have worked with our neighbors of this Hemisphere in the creation of an historic new partnership -- the Alliance for Progress -- and we have attained with them -- the isolation, quarantine, and exclusion of Communist Cuba from the Inter-American community.

Finally, we have witnessed -- and treated with care and prudence -- one of the greatest cataclysmic changes of modern history -- a change that aids the cause of freedom -- the disruption and fragmentation of the Sino-Soviet empire.

This is our record for the past four years. It is a record of solid progress -- our Allies know it, our adversaries know it, and the American people know it.

No rational, responsible leadership can promise

us speedy escape from world problems which demanded prolonged effort for solution. All that can be honestly promised is what President Johnson has given us; unremitting, constructive ^{leadership} ~~work~~ -- with hopeful advances and with the peace preserved, but with continued need for vigilance and dedication.

President Johnson, like Presidents Kennedy, Eisenhower, and Truman, before him, realizes that we are living in a new era, an era unique in human history. Since that day at Alamagordo when man acquired the power to obliterate himself from the face of the earth, war has worn a new face. And the vision of it has sobered all responsible leaders and demanded of them a higher order of responsibility.

In the nuclear age, the deliberate initiation of full-scale war as an instrument of national policy has become an absurdity. Originally a means to

protect national interests, war today can assure the death of a nation. Although we will continue to repel all intimidation, we shall continue to realize that the use of nuclear ultimatum should play no part in ~~our own~~ ^{the} conduct of ^{our} affairs with other nations.

My pledge to you is that this Administration will always seek to blunt the conflicts which may lead to war, not to escalate them. We shall always strive to avoid a position in regards to the Soviet Union which will leave no choice but surrender or nuclear war.

In the nuclear age, we must not let ourselves surrender to panic and desperation. We must have a vision of the future which foresees a world in which nuclear war is not inevitable, in which both the

peace and our freedom will be preserved.

President Johnson, like President Kennedy before him, has such a vision.

When I was in Washington recently, I noticed that the wooden stands for next January's Presidential Inauguration are now being constructed^{ed} in front of the Capitol building. Four years ago, we all watched President Kennedy accept the torch of leadership and commit his Administration to a vision of preserving both the peace and our freedom. Although his own life was brutally extinguished, the torch he bore burns on in the programs and ideals which his successor carries on.

America must never witness the extinction of the torch of our world leadership by the bitter whirlwind of nuclear holocaust.

In this time of true national testing, let us remember the message of the Scriptures -- without vision, the people perish. Let us hold fast to our vision of America and of the need for world peace.

If we work with diligence and act with wisdom, this glorious American vision -- conceived in hope -- forged in battle -- tested in adversity -- shall not perish from the earth.

###

The events of recent days---the shake-up in the Kremlin leadership, the detonation of a nuclear device by Communist China, the change in government in Great Britain, remind us once again of the highly changeable nature of the world in which we live. The events ~~of~~ which occurred in the Communist world remind us once again of the delicate balance of peace ~~which is maintained~~ ^{world} that this balance is especially ~~difficult~~ delicate in ~~of the world, and the need for~~ ~~heightened need to~~ times of great international change. Such changes impress upon us once ~~continue our prudent policies to maintain this balance in a time of~~ again the need for responsibility in the exercise of Presidential power.

Fortunately, we now have a President who has the wisdom to understand these ~~world~~ international changes and ~~has~~ the skill and ^{vision} ~~patience~~ necessary to preserve the balance of world peace.

Of prime importance ^{in preserving} ~~in maintaining~~ this delicate balance of peace is the maintenance in this country of the bi-partisan tradition in foreign policy, a tradition which characterized the approach of four Presidents-- Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson. We must continue to give unswerving support to the United Nations, to sensible programs of foreign aid such as the Alliance for Progress, ^{and} to creative programs like the Peace Corps and Food for peace, ^W We must continue to build bridges of hope to the oppressed people of the Communist nations, and to attempt to reach realistic agreements

to tame the atom before it maims us.

During the past four years we have continued ^{to act in accordance with the} ~~this~~ great bi-partisan ^{are the results} guidelines. ~~What is the picture of the conduct of~~ ^{our conduct of} foreign policy

for the past four years? I will briefly sketch out the broad outlines:

...We have greatly widened the gap between U.S. and Soviet strategic military power.

We have ~~met the Communist~~ responded with power, restraint and precision to each Communist probe of our will and intentions---in Cuba, in Berlin, in Vietnam and in the Gulf of Tonkin.

We have vastly widened ~~the gap between the U.S. and the~~ the massive economic superiority of the U.S. and the Western world over the Communist world

We have diminished the danger of nuclear war through misunderstanding by the establishment of the hot line between Washington and Moscow.

We have taken the first step in history toward the control of nuclear weapons and the end of atmospheric poisoning through achieving ^{the} test-ban treaty.

We have worked with our neighbors of this Hemisphere in the creation of an historic new partnership---the Alliance for Progress---and we have attained with them--the isolation, quarantine, and exclusion of Communist Cuba from the Inter-American community.

Finally, we have witnessed ---and treated with care and prudence---
one of the greatest cataclysmic changes of modern history---a change that
aids the cause of freedom---the disruption and fragmentation of the ~~Sin~~^{Sin}-Soviet
empire.

This, ~~then~~, is our record for the past four years. It is a record of
solid progress---our Allies know it, our adversaries now it, and the American
people know it.

No rational, responsible leadership can promise us speedy escape from
~~world~~ problems which demanded prolonged effort for solution. All that can be
honestly promised is what President Johnson has given us; unremitting,
constructive work---with hopeful advances and with the peace preserved, but
with continued need for vigilance and dedication.

President Johnson, like Presidents Kennedy, Eisenhower, and Truman, before
him, realizes that we are living in a new era, an era ~~unlike any~~ unique in
human history. Since that day at Alamogordo when man acquired the power to
obliterate himself from the face of the earth, war has worn a new face. And
the vision of it has sobered all ~~responsible~~ ^{responsible} leaders and demanded of them a
higher order of responsibility.

In the nuclear age, the deliberate initiation of full-scale war as an

instrument of national policy has become an absurdity. Originally a means to protect national interests, war today can assure the death of a nation. Although we will ~~we~~ continue to repel all intimidation, we shall continue to realize that the the use of nuclear ultimatum should play no part in our own conduct of affairs with other nations.

My pledge to you is that this Administration will always seek to blunt ~~the~~ the conflicts which may lead to war, not to escalate them. We shall always strive to avoid a position ~~we~~ in regards to the Soviet Union which will leave no choice but surrender or nuclear war.

In the nuclear age, we must not let ourselves surrender to panic and desperation. We must have a vision of the future which foresess a world in which nuclear war is not inevitable, in which ~~the~~ both the peace and our freedom will be preserved.

President ~~Kennedy and~~ Johnson, like President Kennedy before him, has such a vision.

Wooden & Steel
stands

When I was in Washington, recently, I noticed that the ~~px~~ construction ~~stands~~ for next January's Presidential Inauguration ~~were~~ are now being constructed in front of the Capitol building. Four years ago, we all watched President Kennedy accept the torch of leadership and commit his Administration to a vision of preserving both the peace and our freedom. Although his own life was brutally extinguished, the torch he bore burns on in the programs and ideals which his successor carries on.

America must never witness the extinction of the torch of our world leadership by the bitter whirlwind of nuclear holocaust.

In this time of true national testing, let us remember the message of the Scriptures---without vision, the people perish. Let us hold fast ~~ten~~ to our vision of American and of the need for world peace.

If we work with dilligence and act with wisdom, this glorious American vision---conceived in hope---forged in battle---tested in adversity---shall not perish from the earth.

SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY

T. V. Taping - WXYZ
Detroit, Michigan
Saturday, October 24, 1964

At this time, I think I ought to just say to you that I am delighted.

THE ANNOUNCER: The participants are Senator Hart, Congressman Staebler, Bob Perrin, and our boy, Humphrey.

MR. PERRIN: Gentlemen, here are some of the questions that have come into rather sharp focus in the closing days of the campaign.

Senator Humphrey, we would like to start with you.

The dramatic world events of the past few weeks in Moscow, China and elsewhere have caused the American people new concern over the basic issue of war and peace. Why do you feel you and President Johnson are better equipped to meet these challenges than Senator Goldwater and his running mate?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I would say that we surely live in very perilous days and with the changes that have taken place in the political structure in the Soviet Union, changes that yet may have further developments, and with Communist China detonating a nuclear device, all of this throws the world situation into somewhat of a turmoil and, at least, some unpredictability.

I believe that President Johnson is much better equipped to meet these situations, primarily because he follows and adheres to an established bipartisan foreign policy that has been credited out of the minds of not just Democrats but Democrats and Republicans.

As a matter of fact, now that I mention it, it was right here in this state that one of the great men of our time came and contributed so much to this bipartisan foreign policy, the late Arthur Vandenburg. When we faced the Communist menace in Greece and Turkey, in the period of President Truman's presidency, it was President Truman and Arthur Vandenburg who joined hands to meet that situation.

From that day to this very hour, through the administrations of President Eisenhower, President Kennedy and President Johnson, we have had a bipartisan support that is a basic understanding of the two great political parties as to the nature of our foreign policy, how it would develop, how it would be applied, and also as to our total national security policy.

President Johnson is a part of that great program. He supported President Eisenhower in foreign policy, as Hubert Humphrey did, and as Philip A. Hart did, and we put our country above any party consideration. There ought not to be real party positions on matters of international security.

So I say that President Johnson is equipped by knowledge, by background and experience, and by temperament -- his rationale attitude, his willingness to pause and wait, and see what to do with these developments, He has the confidence and the trust of our allies. This is very, very important. He is not impetuous or irresponsible. The whole theme of President Johnson's life, as Senator, Vice President, and President, has been one of responsibility, of trying to act, not as an opposition or not merely as an advocate, but as a responsible public servant.

In this day and age, where you have these fantastic developments in unpredictable matters, I think you need a man that is wise and prudent, that is not only bright but also has some wisdom with it, and that has a sense of calm and a sense of perception of what is going on.

I regret to say that the opposition, Mr. Goldwater, has not demonstrated he had those qualities. It's not just Hubert Humphrey who says this.

Gentlemen, there is a New York Herald Tribune editorial -- a Republican newspaper -- that I think was most demonstrative of what I am saying. It said that in sum -- looking at the total picture -- Senator Goldwater lacks an understanding of the world in which we live, has given the image of being impetuous and irresponsible and tries to find simple answers to very complicated problems. I am only paraphrasing the editorial.

I think if the opposition would take a look at the editorial in Life, the editorial in Saturday Evening Post, the New York Herald Tribune, the

editorials that have come from the Knight papers, from the Scripps-Howard papers, and others, you will begin to see that these traditional Republican-oriented newspapers and their editorial policies have come to President Johnson primarily because he is a more responsible voice, a more responsible and prudent and cautious man in areas of foreign policy.

In reference to your question, sir, that's why I believe we need President Johnson as President of the United States.

MR. PERRIN: Congressman Staebler, here is one for you.

Michigan's prosperity is up, unemployment is down. Why should we change governors?

CONGRESSMAN STAEBLER: The present Governor has played down the influence of national programs on Michigan's prosperity. 85 per cent of the cars we make, Senator, in Michigan, are sold in other states. But that is only part of what he's has been boasting about. He has boasted that he has changed Michigan from a bankrupt state to a solvent state, ignoring the fact that it was a set of nuisance taxes passed in the previous administration that accomplished that.

Now he has been exhibiting magnificent showmanship in Michigan, but not much leadership. Two of the serious failures of leadership, for instance, occurred in the field of fiscal reform and in the field of help for our senior citizens in their property taxes, but these are only part of his failures.

The greatest failures have been the failure to pay attention to Michigan's needs. Michigan needs more school aid, state school aid. We need more attention to the drop-out problem. Our juvenile delinquency has gotten out of hand. And our mental health program has practically stalled.

We need community mental health programs, and we are not getting them at anything like the rate we ought to have. So, what I am suggesting is a program of action.

First of all, school aid. The governor has put a lot of money into a building program that ought to go into the operation of our schools. That will help the schools. It can give us a chance to attack the drop-out problem, to keep property taxes from rising. We can roll back the property taxes for our senior citizens.

We need, in addition to that, to speed up our mental health program. We need to pass an equitable labor legislation. Our farmers have been totally neglected. They have several important things they want done in the state -- a unified dairy inspection and meat inspection.

We need an office of small business to help our small businessmen in the Department of Economic Development.

What we need in Michigan is not the showmanship, not this era of boasting of great accomplishments. We need action and we are not getting it. That's why we need a new governor.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Neil, if it's agreeable, can I just comment in here for a minute? Because you have said what you need is action and not showmanship.

You have also indicated the relevance or the relationship between what is happening here in Michigan and at the national level. I think those are very pertinent observations. The fact is that you may recall back in 1960, our country was in its third recession of that eight-year period. That recession was taking a big toll in unemployment, in revenues, in loss of income, in jobs. Industrial capacity was down; unused capacity -- about 10 or 15 per cent of our total capacity being unused.

Then President Kennedy came in and said, in those dramatic words in that inaugural address: "Let us begin. Let us get this country moving."

And in many areas, in investment tax credit, tax reforms, manpower re-training, programs of encouragement of industry, accelerated depreciations schedules, minimum wage improvement, unemployment compensation, accelerated

public works, area development, we got this country moving.

Do you realize that since -- we have increased the gross national product by over \$125 billion in the past --

CONGRESSMAN STAEBLER: That's 25 per cent.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: An increase of about 25 per cent.

CONGRESSMAN STAEBLER: In less than four years.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: That's correct, and I saw that figure yesterday, which was almost startling, that since President Johnson came in as President, following the tragic death of President Kennedy, the stock market values, the values on the New York Stock Exchange have gone up \$100 billion.

CONGRESSMAN STAEBLER: That's confidence.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: That's confidence, and this stock market has had, you might say, a wringing-out period and has come back to a constructive valuation.

Now, this 44 consecutive months of economic growth at the national level is unprecedented. There has never been anything like this in the history of our country, never before. We have had almost four years of no recession, no retreat.

This is unprecedented in the history of economic growth and expansion. So your jobs are up. Your income is up. For a family of four, it's up a little over \$1000. Your profits are up. Your wages are up. That means a higher purchasing power.

I might add, Neil and Phil, that when that happens, it helps Minnesota; it helps Michigan, your great state. It helps --

CONGRESSMAN STAEBLER: It helps revenues, too, because Michigan is a hard-goods state. When times are bad, we fall further. When times are good, we rise higher. That's what is happening now.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I remember your unemployment situation in Detroit in 1960, early 1960, and '61, in the automobile industry. Today, more power to you, you're building great cars; the employment is booming. All we need is a little more bargaining space.

MR. PERRIN: The Democrats have emphasized the record of the 88th Congress, how good it was --

SENATOR HART: It was.

MR. PERRIN: Yet Congress was unable to pass a medicare program of hospital insurance for elderly Americans. Was all of this talk just an election year gambit to win the senior citizen vote?

SENATOR HART: Of course not. We came closer to winning medicare this time than we ever have before. For the first time in history, we got it through the House -- one House. I am glad to say it was the Senate. We are going to win this one, because, needless to say, the concept is right. For older people, with their increasing health needs at the end of life, it's important to their children, who unhappily sometimes have to elect between sending their children to college and taking care of mother and father, and it's vitally important to the dignity of the older person.

We are going to win. This isn't an election year gambit.

This was what John Kennedy committed us to and what Lyndon Johnson has said we are going to do, and we are going to do it.

CONGRESSMAN STAEBLER: And, Senator, since you pointed out that it was the House of Representatives who failed to put it through --

SENATOR HART: Neil Staebler voted for it.

CONGRESSMAN STAEBLER: I think what would help most would be the election of so more Democratic Congressmen from Michigan. There are some in this very locality that would vote for it.

SENATOR HART: Right in Michigan.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Could I just say the election, yes, of Democratic Congressmen, and the re-election of Philip Hart, and other Democrats in other states would be very helpful. People are committed to this program of social security improvement and expansion and medicare. But I believe we ought to just set the record straight.

Mr. Goldwater not only voted against hospital and nursing home care, the modified beginning program under social security, he also voted against the Kerr-Mills Bill, the Kerr-Mills Bill, which was a program that was supported overwhelmingly in the Congress of the United States. In fact, over 75 per cent of all the Congressmen, better than that, voted for it en masse. But not Senator Goldwater. He voted against the Kerr-Mills.

That's where you have the program of just taking care of the indigent and the needy. He voted against a program of improvement of old-age assistance, under which people who would earn up to \$50 a month would be able to earn that \$50 a month, and still have their old-age assistance benefit.

He voted against including the disabled persons under social security -- those totally disabled. That program was sponsored by the late Senator Walter George of Georgia, and it was a conservative program. Robert Taft supported that program and supported it vigorously.

He voted against housing for the elderly, which is one of the finest programs we have.

Now, notice what we have been doing. What is happening in America in all too many cities is in old people with incomes of \$1000, \$1200, \$1400 a year. They are being shunted off in the attics of third and fourth story buildings in old parts of the cities, just as we once used to put the mentally retarded, and hid them away, before we became humane and decent and started taking care of these loved ones, these real little, blessed loved ones, and those who were the victims of terrible tragedy.

We used to put them away, just shut them away. Now, we have them out where we can do something for them, passing aid for the mentally retarded, doing something in the way of scientific, loving care for these people.

We are trying to do that now for the elderly. The elderly

have a higher rate of sickness, the poorest housing, poorest conditions, the least chance for work.

The Senator from Arizona, I regret to say, because it makes my heart heavy to say it, this Senator has voted against every single one of these programs and not given one bit of help to our local communities or volunteer his assistance to try to do something about it.

MR. PERRIN: Senator Humphrey, let us assume you and President Johnson are going to be successful on November 3rd--

SENATOR HART: Let's say we'll miss it enormously if the majority don't win, but we will be delighted to keep him in the Senate.

MR. PERRIN: Assuming you are both going to be successful, what difference does it make to you who is Governor of Michigan?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Oh, well, it makes a great deal of difference as to not only who is Governor of Michigan -- may I say, even though that is where we are talking right now -- but it makes a great deal of difference who is Governor is any of these states. Because the lesson that we need to learn in American government is that our government is not in Washington. That is part of our government. Our government is in Washington; it's in your state capital; it's at your county courthouse, at the village hall, in the city council. Government in America is a partnership.

It's a coordinated system of government. Most of the government activities, gentlemen, are at the local level. It's the local level of government who tells you what your speed rate will be on your highways, takes care of your highways, takes care of your social and economic problems.

The Federal government can help. The Federal government supplements. The Federal government is a partner, but the Federal government doesn't provide for your highway speeds, your police patrols, and so on.

You need at your state capital a Governor that is in harmony with, in sympathy with, in coordination with the policies of the national government. Why? So as to get the most out of the taxpayer's dollar, to see to it that these programs that are available are actually initiated and that they are carried out vigorously and effectively. That's why I think Neil Staebler, who has helped design many of these programs, who has been a faithful supporter of the progressive social and economic policies of President Kennedy and President Johnson. If he can be elected Governor in your state, you are going to get more out of every tax dollar that is spent, you are going to get more out of every program that is available, and you are going to have real cooperation for business, for labor, for your educators, for your students, with the Federal government. That is a good investment.

CONGRESSMAN STAEBLER: Senator, let me just illustrate what you have just said.

The present government in one single program, aid to dependent children of the unemployed, lost the State of Michigan \$20 million by his obstinate refusal to cooperate with the Federal government. A year later, he did, but in the interval, we lost

WXYZ - page 6

\$20 million.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: There would not have been any interval if Neil Staebler had been Governor.

CONGRESSMAN STAEBLER: Correct.

MR. PERRIN: Congressman Staebler, you have been accused of running against Senator Goldwater rather than George Romney. How do you answer that?

CONGRESSMAN STAEBLER: Well, the Governor is very unhappy when I mention the fact, because in some parts of the state, particularly the east side, he tries to disavow Mr. Goldwater, but on the west side of the state, he is running with him. The billboards there carry him half-Goldwater, half-Romney. The center spread of The Michigan Farmer, in the last issue, two pages -- one page Goldwater, one page Romney. He is part of the team and he is not running away from that team.

But there is a more important reason and that is he thinks like Mr. Goldwater on most questions. Now, he has dwelled on a couple of points where he differs, and I give him credit for that. But on most things, he has that same superficial attitude toward government that -- shove it back to the localities whether they can afford to pay for a service or not, don't let the Federal government in, we are suspicious of the Federal government.

To illustrate -- the war on poverty. At the very same time that the President was talking about the war on poverty, the governor was in Chicago saying he had already won the war on poverty. He doesn't even understand it, or didn't at that time. I have noticed since the campaign has heated up, he has paid a great deal more attention to it. In fact, he is coming closer and closer to our position on it.

MR. PERRIN: Well, speaking of poverty, gentlemen, you all three have the distinction of having voted in the Congress for the war on poverty bill.

Senator Humphrey, in fact, is one of the architects of that program. You all three voted for it, yet Senator Goldwater calls it a hoax. Is it?

Senator Hart?

SENATOR HART: My dear colleague from Arizona claims that everything is a hoax that he doesn't agree with, and he disagrees with about everything we have done.

Look, we have never lost a war in this nation and we are not going to lose this one. The worst thing we could do, the most costly thing we could do about poverty is to do nothing. There are a lot of bypassed people in this affluent society of ours and we are going to zero in on them with just the straight way that we would zero in on an enemy. Poverty, harsh poverty, in the midst of plenty, destroys the plentiful.

You're right. We are going to win this one and this is no hoax. This is exactly what they said about the Peace Corps, and history is in on that one. That is a success. And Barry was against that.

CONGRESSMAN STAEBLER: Senator Hart hasn't said so, but his opponent calls the war on poverty a hoax, a cheap political trick.

SENATOR HART: That's exactly the label he put on the Peace Corps, and history is against him on that one. That one is a success.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think the war on poverty isn't just to wage war on the economics, that is, on low income. It is a war on illiteracy, a war on inadequate education. It's a mobilization of community resources.

What the Economic Opportunity Act did, and what the war on poverty means, is the re-grouping, the remobilization of the resources of America -- Federal, state, and local, and voluntarily at the community level, with some Federal and state participation. As you said, to zero in on these particular problems, which can gnaw away at you and consume you.

There are little pockets of malignancy, economic and social malignancy. We have to eradicate them. We have to cure them.

We are now setting up a command staff, as you know. The whole economic and social structure of our government, the programs and policies, are under careful review for the new budget that will be presented by the President in the 89th Congress.

One of the points I want to make clear to you under that re-examination is that in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and in the Bureau of the Budget, in cooperation with the Council of Economic Advisors to the President, is a review of our whole social structure in an effort to improve it, to make it more meaningful. One of the areas of review is to try to find a way that we can incorporate in social security a formula that will provide for cost of living increases, so that you arrive at a base point and then you automatically -- if the cost of living goes up -- there are automatic increases in the social security payments.

Now, we have got to do this without jeopardizing the solvency of the fund, but we have the best economists in America right now on a task force working on that. This, plus review of our vocational aid, review of our whole social and welfare programs, with the war on poverty program, I think, will represent a singular advance in America, and it will again be fruitful because you get more out of each dollar you spend.

This is one thing I like about President Johnson, gentlemen. This man watches that budget like a hawk. He insists that there be economy in government without sacrificing human needs.

We have reduced Federal employment. We have kept within a budget figure that was agreed upon. In fact, we have reduced the budget figure this over even what President Johnson presented to the Congress.

CONGRESSMAN STAEBLER: When he first presented the war on poverty to Congress, he pointed out that he was paying for it out of savings, real savings, in the Defense program.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: That's right, and in the cut-down on

civilian employment. We actually have about 25 thousand fewer civilian employees now than we had a year ago, and we have been able to make some real savings through careful management in the Defense Department without sacrificing in any way the strength of our defense structure.

CONGRESSMAN STAEBLER: Could I add one more thing? I'm glad you emphasized the state and local aspects, because the state can do other things besides just implement the Federal program. We can attack this, too, at its very root. The root of the problem is the school drop-out program.

SENATOR HART: We would like to have a governor who voted to go to war on poverty, as you did.

MR. PERRIN: Let's have a quick answer here, next.

Senator Humphrey, we were talking about the Peace Corps, and the labels put on it. I understand Senator Goldwater has called the Peace Corps a "haven of beatniks". Could you comment on that?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, he called it that and he voted against it. I must say I hope he will retract that statement, you know.

SENATOR HART: If he retracts that, look at all the others he will have to.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I know. There are so many programs. You said a moment ago here, Phil, that history is already recording that the Peace Corps is a success and it is. Every country in the world that is not in the Communist orbit wants some of our Peace Corps volunteers. These people are young -- some of them are. They are young in spirit, but they have many older workers. It's one of the finest examples of American compassion to help people help themselves that we have ever had.

I don't know of any responsible American today, gentlemen, that says the Peace Corps is a failure. I think that most of us know that it is a great success and it is an insult to call it a "haven for beatniks." That -- well, all I can say is I wish he'd retract it.

SENATOR HART: Well, he's got so much else to back off on.

MR. PERRIN: Senator Humphrey, as our guest in Michigan today, I would like to ask the final question of you.

Your party's campaign literature states "Vote Democratic on November 3rd. the stakes are too high to stay home." Why should people vote Democratic? Why is that statement emphasized so much?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: It's my view that 30 years of economic and social progress is on the line in this election. The great programs that we have worked so hard to build, that we have talked about on this program -- they are either going to be reaffirmed or they are going to be vetoed. Vetoing them means voting for Mr. Goldwater. To reaffirm them and say this is a plateau on which we will rebuild for a better America is to vote for President Johnson.

Then, our bipartisan foreign policy, gentlemen, is on the line in this election. Senator Goldwater has repudiated that bipartisan foreign policy on every tenet and every principle of it.

I think peace is on the line, because Senator Goldwater seems to think that force is the way you settle the problems of the

WXYZ - 9

world. We happen to feel that strength is important to the accomplishment of peace, but strength to be used to win the war, to win it strictly over war itself. We want a victory. We want a victory of winning the war against war. We want a victory of winning a victory for mankind, and we want a real victory of winning a victory for peace.

And this requires patience, perseverance. It requires reason. It requires the kind of dedication to the cause of a just and early peace that I believe we have seen in President Kennedy and we now see in President Johnson. These are the stakes in the election.

SENATOR HART: And we want a man as Vice President, because Dallas is fresh enough in our minds to recognize the quality of Hubert Humphrey.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: We need to take this seriously, because November 3rd is not just election day. November 3rd is citizenship day. On that day, the citizen is sovereign. He will determine whether we go forward or backward. I think we are going forward with President Johnson, Neil Staebler here, Philip Hart.

MR. PERRIN: Gentlemen, it has been a most informative visit. Thank you very much.

- end -

BACKGROUND - DETROIT

Peace, prosperity, economic progress, and responsible national leadership seem to be the generally acceptable campaign themes. Michigan Democrats are also pushing the idea "we need teamwork from the State House to the White House" -- so Michigan can prosper as the Nation prospers."

It appears that your job is not so much to persuade people that the Johnson-Humphrey ticket is good for the country as it is to make sure they get out and vote. One theme your Democratic friends hope you will hit is "morality and integrity in Government." They fear the negative impact of Bobby Baker, Walter Jenkins, and the vast amount of right-wing smear material that has been distributed in Detroit. Another theme they hope you will hit is responsible leadership and national prosperity being good for the nation and good for Michigan. People in Detroit are very much aware that the prosperity of the auto industry depends on prosperity elsewhere in the nation. 85% of the cars made in Michigan are sold outside the State.

Also in line with the prosperity and responsible leadership themes is the good effect of the 1964 tax cut which is increasing the take-home pay of Michigan workers by \$386 million a year.

DETROIT

- 2 -

A lot of right-wing smear literature is being distributed in Wayne County. They hope you will lambast the radical right and the Republicans for using smear, and low smear, tactics.

At the various suburban shopping centers you will visit, the most appealing issues appear to be -- responsible national leadership, peace, prosperity, and consumer protection. Establishment of the Food Marketing Commission is an accomplished fact. Truth in packaging is an issue which Senator Hart is pushing.

Background Information on Dearborn

Dearborn is primarily inhabited by workers in the Ford Corporation. Most of the factories in town are either Ford plants or Ford suppliers. It is well known throughout the area for its policy of excluding all but white residents. Its Mayor, Orville Hubbard, has been reelected time and time again on an almost segregationist platform. Dearborn residents are by no means fully unified behind this but, to judge from election returns, the majority support him. Civil rights talk will antagonize local residents and please Detroiters.

Background Information on Taylor Township

Taylor Township is a solid industrial area.

Bread and butter issues are no doubt best here,

Particularly strong in union membership ~~with~~ ^{and} no

doubt Goldwater's statements about right-to-work

etc. are best attacked in front of such an audience.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR SATURDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1964

Hamtramck

(Large Polish ethnic audience)

1. This is a strong Kennedy area. Some stress should be given to him and the continuity of policies and ideals. He spoke here in 1960--October 26.

Immigration per se is also not a popular issue. While reuniting families is of course approved, some threat to jobs and security is felt at the possibility of a new wave of immigration.

2. The population is largely still of Polish extraction second and third generation. While proud of their background and origin they do not particularly identify themselves with Poland as a nation-state. The stress should be on the independent spirit of Polish nationalism and the long and faithful adherence to the idea of freedom. These people are proud that they are the results of a free choice of citizenship.

3. The population of Hamtramck has declined in the last decade and the proportion of oldsters is much higher than in many other communities. Medicare is a very popular issue, as are other social welfare programs.

4. Civil Rights. The population of this area has remained stable. But the population is sensitive about the civil rights issue, especially on the matter of property values. They feel that they have been singled out as a group that is reacting most strongly to the Negro demands and as most susceptible to the backlash.

5. The chief employer of the city is the Chrysler-Dodge plant. Like the rest of the auto industry, it has been doing well for the past three years, and the community is in pretty good shape financially. Stress the "continuity-of-the-economy under beneficial policies" theme. No time to hand the economy to the wreckers and bunglers.

PAST VILIFICATIONS OF UNITED STATES PRESIDENTS

Defaming Presidents is an ancient and dishonorable pastime in American politics. The degree of virulence has always been a direct function of the success, and the idealism, of the President.

George Washington was called "treacherous in private friendship...a hypocrite in public life." The Father of our Country was told that "the world will be puzzled to decide whether you are an apostate or an imposter; whether you have abandoned good principles, or whether you ever had any?"

Jefferson was accused of being an atheist designing to destroy Christianity because he did not believe in public support of religion. He was also called at one

time or another a French agent, a traitor, a spendthrift (because the French allegedly cheated us when they charged 2 1/2 cents an acre for the Louisiana Purchase!), and, of course, a dictator.

Andrew Jackson was accused of a bigamous marriage.

He later said:

"Mrs. Jackson is not spared and my pious mother, nearly fifty years in the tomb, and who, from her cradle to her death, had not a speck upon her character, has been dragged forth...and held to public scorn as a prostitute... I am branded with every crime."

Probably no President has ever been so maligned as Abraham Lincoln. When he was elected, Edwin Stanton (later to be his Secretary of War) called him a "clumsy clown"

and an "ogre." This was trivial compared with later attacks:

Lincoln was a "vulgar, swaggering usurper."

(Carlinville, Ill. Spectator)

Lincoln was "unstable and controlled by traitor generals!" (Senator Zack Chandler)

"Despot Lincoln" (Ashland, Ohio, Union) His tock in trade were "abolition lies." The "war fervor is to be raised to fever heat and the people to be again fooled into voting for Lincoln." (Canton, Ohio newspaper)

"Lincoln will be most unquestionably defeated (in the 1864 election) unless he should use the military power in his hands by suppressing the freedom of elections."

(Senator Pomeroy)

"The true and only treatment which that miserable and contemptible despot Lincoln should receive at the hands of (the House of Representatives) is silent and unmitigated contempt... (Lincoln was a) wretched and detestable abortion whose contemptible emptiness and folly will only receive the ridicule of the civilized world." (Representative Foote on floor of the House)

After Lincoln's assassination, President Andrew Johnson came in for plenty of abuse. The New York World called him an "insolent, drunken brute," and enemies spread the story that he had been "privy to Lincoln's assassination." He had the "face of a demagogue, the heart of a traitor;" he was "touched with insanity, corrupted with lust, stimulated with drink."

Interestingly enough, Johnson was accused of complicity in "violence in the streets." A July, 1866 riot in New Orleans was laid at his door: "This man aided and abetted the New Orleans riot. He doubly inspired the murderers." An opponent said "hold up the President's hands...reveal that they are red with blood."

SPEECH SECTION: PROSPERITY THEMES

Almost everywhere around here I see unmistakable signs of prosperity. And that is no wonder. You are sharing in 44 consecutive months of economic prosperity. This is the longest solid stretch of economic growth in the history of the United States.

Do you remember the stagnant Fifties -- when a Republican Administration dawdled and bumbled along, letting a misguided economy take its own course?

-- Do you remember their helplessness in the face of three serious recessions? (1953-54, 1957-58, 1960)

-- Do you remember how they ran up the highest peace-time deficit on record -- a deficit which reached \$12.4 billion in 1959?

-- Do you remember how they let unemployment increase until it reached almost 7 percent in 1960?

Do you remember how the Kennedy-Johnson Administration came in and took decisive action to get America moving

again? The results are what we see today.

-- The average American today has a take-home pay of about \$2,200 a year. That is \$225 more than in 1960 -- at the same price levels.

-- The average factory worker earns \$103 a week - compared with only \$89 at the end of 1960.

-- American consumers have an extra \$8 billion in their pockets this year as a result of the Kennedy-Johnson tax cut. When this is spent, it will help generate another \$32 billion in income this year.

-- The 20 million American stockholders will receive dividend checks this year totalling 11 percent more dollars than a year ago.

-- And these remarkable gains in a growing and prosperous economy have been made with stable prices.

President Johnson's Administration has passed the most rigid test. They have demonstrated that government

can maximize prosperity, prevent inflation, and keep the economy moving full-steam ahead.

Senator Goldwater has proved, time and again, that his ideas are extreme, radical, and amateurish. Do you want your government to be dizzy with deficits? Do you want him to tinker with your prosperity? Do you want him to run economic experiments, with you as the guinea pigs? Do you want Senator Goldwater to sow his wild oats in the American economy?

Or do you want President Johnson and prosperity?

United States Senate

MEMORANDUM

Foreign Trade

Statement -

Now tentatively
planning it for
Tues. AM. release

JER

STATEMENT BY HUMPHREY ON TRADE POLICY

In the field of trade policy, the Goldwater faction of the Republican Party is offering the voters a choice and not an echo -- a choice between either continuing a bipartisan trade expansion policy pursued for thirty years with great benefit to American business and agriculture or the destruction of the advances we have made in the last three decades.

Ever since the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, the United States Government has worked for the expansion of international trade. The Act has been extended 11 times under Republican and Democratic Administrations alike. Most recently, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 was endorsed by an overwhelming majority of Democrats and Republicans in the Senate -- but not by Senator Goldwater.

Last month, Senator Goldwater sought to explain away this vote, and claimed that he has never been a protectionist at heart.⁽¹⁾ He will, however, need a whole packet of alibis to explain away the fact that, in 14 key votes on trade expansion during his 12 years in the Senate, he voted on the protectionist side 13 times.⁽²⁾ Senator Goldwater's record speaks louder than his current alibi. And, the platform

(1) BUSINESS WEEK, September 26, 1964, p. 180.

(2) TRADE TALK, Committee for a National Trade Policy, July 23, 1964, p. 5.

adopted by his faction in San Francisco speaks the same language of protectionism.

There is no trace in this platform of any appreciation or understanding of the benefits of trade expansion to our economy. Since 1934, our foreign trade has multiplied more than ten times -- from \$3.8 billion in 1934 to a current annual rate of \$42.5 billion. Our exports are running at an annual rate of \$24.5 billion. This represents a favorable balance to our country of \$6.5 billion annually compared to our imports. Foreign trade provides jobs for more than four million American workers, and our trade surpluses have made a massive contribution toward easing the balance of payments problem which the Democratic Administration inherited in 1961.

No group in our economy has a greater stake in international trade than our farmers. In the twelve months ending with June, we exported over \$6.1 billion in agricultural products -- equivalent to the crops from one out of four acres of our harvested land.

Throughout the world, people are buying and using American products. Their quality, their variety, and their competitive price give tangible testimony to the high performance of our free enterprise system.

In the past few years, there have been great changes in the patterns of international trade. There are new problems to be met and new opportunities to be seized.

First, there has been the emergence and development of trading blocs which transcend national boundaries. As other nations have come to realize what great advantages our huge internal market have given us, they have sought to profit from our example. Thus, there have come into being the European Common Market, the European Free Trade Association, the Central American Common Market, and the Latin American Free Trade Association. Each grouping is in the process of eliminating tariffs and other barriers to trade among its members.

Secondly, the developing countries are demanding -- with increasing urgency -- the opportunity to play a greater role in international trade. They made this crystal clear at the UN Conference on Trade and Development in Geneva this spring. They want -- and this is much to their credit -- to earn through their exports more of the resources they need for development. They want to be less dependent on external aid.

The growth of trading blocs and the drive of the developing countries for trading opportunities confront us with immediate problems. But they offer long-term opportunities as well. As the members of these new trading blocs achieve accelerated economic growth, they will want to buy more of the things we have to sell.

The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 was carefully tailored to meet these immediate problems and to take full advantage of these long-term opportunities. The negotiations made possible by this Act, the sixth round of international

negotiations under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) -- widely known as the Kennedy Round -- opened in Geneva this spring.

These are the most important and comprehensive trade negotiations in which the United States has ever engaged. They will be lengthy and complex -- and, at times, difficult and delicate.

Up until the Republican Convention, the countries participating in the Geneva talks -- which include all the major trading nations of the free world -- could sit down with us at the bargaining table with full confidence in the seriousness of American purpose. They could take it for granted that our delegation was acting on the basis of policies firmly established for thirty years and strongly supported by the responsible leadership of both our major political parties.

For the time being, they can no longer operate on this assumption, in light of the fact that the Republican Party and its candidates have said, in effect: "Include us out!"

That is one of many reasons why it is vitally important that the American people give a decisive endorsement to the Johnson Administration this November -- one so decisive that it reaffirms the Administration's mandate to speak for the United States at Geneva and elsewhere in the counsels of the nations.

Our negotiators will need that kind of mandate, for they

have an important job to do.

They must seek, by negotiating substantial tariff cuts across the board, to reduce the discrimination against us in a world increasingly grouping into great trading blocs.

They must seek to halt and turn back the rising tide of agricultural protectionism, so that we can maintain and expand our farm exports -- and retain access, for example, to the European Common Market, where we sell \$1.2 billion of agricultural products a year.

They must seek the reduction or removal of the non-tariff barriers which hamper our exports -- barriers such as quotas, state trading practices, discriminatory taxes.

They must seek means of meeting the urgent demands of the developing countries for a greater role in international trade.

These are give-and-take negotiations -- and to secure benefits for ourselves we must offer benefits to others. They will be conducted on the basis of reciprocity.

The benefits of trade expansion are shared by all Americans, but its costs should not be imposed unfairly on a few. That is why, while pressing ahead on the broad front of trade expansion, this Administration has taken specific remedial action for the relief of pressing import problems with regard to textiles, apparel and meat.

Trade expansion has dollars-and-cents advantages to the United States. But it also has a significant role to

play in promoting international cooperation and peace. Trade among the developed nations weaves a seamless web across national frontiers. When nations are busily and profitably trading with one another, they have a powerful incentive to live at peace. For the developing nations, increased trade opportunities can do much to allay the economic discontents from which graver dissensions arise.

Therefore, in a very real sense, every American engaged in international trade is a merchant of peace.

President Kennedy saw clearly the great economic and political importance of increased international trade for the United States and the free world -- and that is why he took the leadership in the enactment of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. President Johnson and his Administration carry on this firm dedication to trade expansion, and are pressing vigorously forward with the international negotiations made possible by the Act.

As President Johnson has said, these are not the kind of negotiations in which some nations need lose because others gain. The increased exchanges among the free nations which can result from these negotiations will be to the advantage of all. As President Kennedy liked to say, "A rising tide lifts all the boats."



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