

FACTS ABOUT ALABAMA'S SCHOOLS

	Alabama	United States	Southeast
1. High School Completion.....	66%	77.8%	
2. Selective Service Mental Test failures.....	24.1%	12.4%	
3. Per child expenditure.....	\$403 (50th)	\$619	11th
4. Local support.....	24.1%	52%	
5. Per capita property tax.....	\$32.99(50th)	\$125.96	
(Property tax is main local tax)			
6. Removal of sales tax exemptions would bring in	\$111,000,000.		
7. Other Sources of Revenue:			
(a) income, (b) gross receipts, (c) admissions, (d) alcoholic beverages, (e) cigarettes, (f) gasoline, (g) motor vehicle, (h) public utility.			
8. Nine of 12 Southeastern States are giving teachers salary increases of \$300-\$1800. The average Alabama teacher's salary is:			
a. 50th in the United States; 12th in the Southeast.			
b. \$3,575 below Florida's average.			
c. \$1,571 below United States' average			
d. \$1,127 below Southeast average			
e. Below all union crafts (\$1,000-\$4,000) except common labor.			

ANALYSIS OF COMPARATIVE GROWTH RATES -- OR WHO FORGOT WHO?

1. Period 1946 to 1952

Income tax returns filed in 1946 - 37,915,696
in 1952 - 42,833,675

Approximate 15% increase.

Adjusted gross income in 1946 - \$118 billion
in 1952 - \$196½ billion

66% increase, or 11% per year.

Salaries and Wages in 1946 - \$99 billion
in 1952 - \$174 billion

75% increase, or 12% per year.

(Adjust for inflation)

2. Period 1952 to 1960

Income tax returns filed increased from 42,833,675 in 1952
to 48,069,985 in 1960

Increase of approximately 5 million

Approximately 11%

Adjusted gross income increased from \$196.6 billion in 1952
to \$297 billion in 1960

A 48% increase, or 6% per year.

Salaries and Wages increased from \$174 billion in 1952
to \$258 billion in 1960

A 48% increase, or 6% per year.

(Wage earner lost to inflation)

3. Period 1960 to 1966

Number of returns filed increased from 48 million in 1960
to 56,709,076 in 1966

11½% increase

Adjusted gross income increased from \$297 billion in 1960
to \$450 billion in 1966

A 51% increase in six years, or 8½% per year.

Salaries and Wages increased from \$258 billion in 1960
to \$381 billion in 1966

A 55% increase in six years, or 9.2% per year.

4. The Forgotten Man

We do not have the Statistics of Income for 1967--however, the Commissioner's Report shows that 1967 total taxes collected was a 15% increase over 1966.

Income tax withheld by employers increased from 42 billion to 50 billion, or 18%,

- and the forgotten man--the self-employed individual--increased from 927 million to 1,775 million--an astounding 91.5%!

A small part of this is due to an increase in the maximum amount of taxes paid from \$405.90 to a maximum of \$422.40. This follows a 39% increase in 1966 over the 1965 self-employment tax collections. The high incomes increased as much as 70 or 80% during 1966.

5. Comparison of Income Levels

A comparison of the income levels demonstrates the dramatic increase in wealth during the recent years. In 1960, out of 48 million returns there were 5 million returns over \$10,000; 20 million between \$5,000 and \$10,000. The bulk of the returns (23 million) were on less than \$5,000 adjusted gross income.

In 1966, with 56,709,076 returns, there were more than 13 million over \$10,000, or a 260% increase over the six years. Between \$5,000 and \$10,000, there were 24 million, a 20% increase. There were 20 million below \$5,000 or a 15% decrease.

In 1960 there was 89 billion AGI reported in returns of more than \$10,000.

In 1966, there was 209 billion in the returns reporting more than \$10,000 AGI -- a 135% increase.

In 1960 the returns between \$5,000 and \$10,000 reported \$138 billion.

In 1966 there was \$181 billion.

In 1960, the returns with less than \$5,000 AGI had \$69 billion income.

In 1966, it was \$59 billion.

In 1960, out of the \$258 billion in wages, there was \$56 billion in returns over \$10,000.

In 1966, there was \$160 billion over \$10,000 -- a 204% increase.

Since 1967 shows an even more dramatic increase, and 1968 seems certain to follow the same pattern, it is hard to tell where the forgotten man is located --

- A. Has he moved up to the high income bracket and forgotten his friends who cut out the eight year depression?
- B. Has he moved up to middle class prosperity from the poverty level of the previous depression--and has he forgotten what it was like back in the "good old days" ?

Copies to speech-writers -

Republicans Hike Taxes More Than Democrats

In three of the last four years (1964, 1965, 1967) a significantly higher percentage of Republican governors raised taxes in their states than did Democratic governors.

For example, in 1967 alone, twice as many Republican governors raised taxes, even though there were an equal number of Democratic and Republican governors--25. Fully 50% of the Republican controlled states had higher tax rates.

In Alabama, taxes have been hiked in two of the last three years.

In 1965, 70% of the Republican governors instituted higher taxes--12 Republican states out of a possible 17.

In 1964, four times more Republican governors raised taxes than did Democratic governors. Only 9% of the Democrats supported a raise.

CONCLUSION: As with the crime statistics, not only is crime higher in Republican controlled states--so too are taxes, i.e. at least there have been more tax increases in Republican states than in Democratic states.

TAX INCREASES-----REPUBLICAN versus DEMOCRAT

Tax Increases -
Number of States

	<u>1964</u>		<u>1965</u>		<u>1966</u>		<u>1967</u>	
	<u>D</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>R</u>
	3	6	17	12	7	2	6	12

Governors -
Number

34(68%) 16(32%) 33(66%) 17(34%) 33(66%) 17(34%) 25(50%) 25(50%)

Tax Increases -
% of States with
Democrat/Republican
Governors

9% 37.5% 51.5% 70% 21% 12% 25% 50%

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

ANSWERS YOUR QUESTIONS

Excerpts from Sessions with Vice President

Humphrey and Citizens and Reporters in the

Spring of 1968

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY ANSWERS YOUR QUESTIONS

<u>Contents</u>	<u>Page</u>
The Changing Program.....	1
The "New Politics".....	2
Revolt in the Ghettos.....	3
The Black Man and the American Dream.....	5
Rural and Urban Poverty.....	7
The Cities.....	11
The Role of Private Enterprise.....	13
Decentralization.....	15
Our Objectives in Vietnam and Paris.....	18
Relations with Communist Countries.....	23
Youth--the Volunteer Generation.....	26
The American Future.....	27
Priorities for the New America.....	28
Humphrey and the Presidency.....	30

Q. Some critics have spoken of the "old Humphrey" and others have questioned your "liberal credentials." What is your comment? (The Spivack Report, June 27, 1968)

A. I can tell those nostalgic critics what happened to the "old Humphrey." I helped convert most of the traditional planks in the liberal platform into the law of the land--civil rights, aid to education, Medicare, housing, aid to cities, job programs, an Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and a lot of other ideas that were once far ahead of their time.

But these victories of the past only obligate me to fight for--and achieve--a new, up-to-date liberal platform--turning the impossible ideas of today into the law of the land tomorrow. That platform includes the right of every able-bodied American to a decent job; the right of every child to a first-class education from the age of four through college, on the basis of his ability to learn and not ability to pay; the right of every American to a wholesome and nutritious diet; the right of every American to a decent home in a decent neighborhood; and the right of every citizen to participate fully in governing that neighborhood--city, state and nation.

This new liberal platform also includes a determination that America shall back up its desire for peace with foreign aid, creative diplomacy, courage and imagination, as readily as it pays its defense bills.

Q. There is much talk about "New Politics." What do you understand this to mean and what relevance has it to the nation's internal and external crises? (The Spivack Report, June 27, 1968)

A. I think the "New Politics" is very real and very healthy--but perhaps not so new. It is a politics of greater involvement of the individual--students, inner-city residents, suburbanites--in deciding their own destiny. Its roots go back to our Populist forebears, to Jefferson, and beyond.

Greater popular participation is enormously relevant to the crisis in our cities. Our urban problems ultimately cannot be solved by decrees or largesse from the federal government--while the people sit on their hands. Federal aid is important, but it is nearly useless without local initiative and action in every community. As a former Mayor, I know that better cities and neighborhoods, better education, jobs, housing and health facilities are created where people live--and only with the active support and involvement by the people themselves.

Q. You have been quoted as saying that you could lead a revolt if you were forced to live in a big-city ghetto. Isn't this just the position of the extremists who have brought so much violence and lawlessness to our cities today? (University of Mississippi, April 25, 1968)

A. What I said was simply this: when people live in conditions, where the tenement house is rat-infested and the child is bitten by a rat, where the water is turned off, where the sewage and modern sanitary facilities are non-existent, where there is nothing but blight and filth and unemployment and degradation, those are the conditions that are almost, if not unbearable,...inexcusable, in this great, great rich land of ours.

And I said, if that happened to my family, or if it happened to my loved ones or myself, that I would have enough spunk and spark, I am sure, left in me to revolt.

I didn't say, to commit violence. In fact, the very next sentence was: "But this does not condone lawlessness or violence"...

/A/ peaceful protest or a revolt through peaceful processes is a great deal different from violence and looting and burning and arson. There isn't a single problem in this country that cannot be answered through the power of the processes of our democracy. Every single one of them can be handled that way.

The greatest danger of this nation today is that we sometimes tend to let the extremists, on the left or the right, the black or

the white--that handful of extremists that are loud and voluble--and at times unbelievably destructive--set the guidelines and be the leaders. I call upon the consensus of the great middle, which represents about 95 or 96 per cent of the American people, to establish its own leadership, and to try to do what is needed to be done in this country because it is right to do it, and not to have ourselves jogged into action, simply because of...calls for rebellion and calls for revolution and calls, if you please, for violence.

But let us, who believe that we can work these things out have our say for a change. Let's demand that we have law and order. And let's remember that a society that wants law enforcement and must have it, must also have conditions that produce law observance. When you have law observance, you have it because people find justice in the law; find opportunity in the law. And that is what we need to have...

Q. You have been quoted as saying you are a believer in the American dream. But as a black man, I do not believe in the American dream because the American dream does not believe in me. If you are elected President, what will you do to restore the Negroes' faith in America and the American dream? (Kent State University, May 3, 1968)

A. Mr. Pickett, the only real reason I want to run for President is to be able to erase from your thinking and your soul and your spirit the feeling you have. I want to make possible what is an American dream. Some of the people that have been called upon to fulfill that dream have not done their work.

I know you are a good American and you are a good man, and I don't blame you for being discouraged; but may I say that there are some of the rest of us who likewise would like to feel that we are good men and that we have something to contribute. You know, there is a word that is used today...in our cities: soul. Well, let me just say to this audience: democracy is not a political institution as much as it is a spiritual concept.... I am proud to say that I am a soul-brother. I have a soul, too. But I believe in human brotherhood.

I know that our cities have ghettos, and I know that there are victims of those ghettos. I know that the black man has been the subject of humiliation and discrimination...I would like to get all our fellow citizens thinking about each other in individual practice in such a manner that they consider United States citizenship to include all of the rights for all of its citizens--black

or white. And I think we can do it. I want to see a man judged on merit. I knew Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and he believed in the American dream. And he asked but one thing: that his children should have their chance to be accepted on the basis of merit and not on the basis of race. That is the way I want it, too.

Q. What is your position on poverty in our nation and what would do about it during your four-year Presidential term of office? (National Association for Community Development,

A. The problems that accompany poverty--unemployment and under-employment, poor education, discrimination, bad housing, inadequate health care--are a national disgrace which America can and must remedy. We have made important progress in the last eight years. But much more can be done.

In my June 15 letter to Dr. Abernathy, I outlined some immediate specific steps I advocate to combat poverty:

1. We should begin to act now on the sensible and attainable agenda set forth by the National Commission on Civil Disorders.
2. We must take prompt administrative and legislative action to establish food stamp and commodity distribution programs in every county where severe problems of hunger exist, and make necessary adjustments and changes in our food distribution programs to assure an adequate, wholesome, and nutritious diet for those in need. School lunches on a year-round basis must be provided every needy child as rapidly as possible. The time has come for a simple and direct declaration of national policy: every American must be provided enough to eat.

3. Every American able to work should be guaranteed a job, with private employers providing job opportunities to the fullest

extent possible and the government making whatever back-up financing arrangements are necessary. It is time to begin a program of public service employment as set forth in the Clark-O'Hara legislation now pending in Congress. These public services are needed; so are the jobs.

4. Congress should act without delay to include farm workers under the National Labor Relations Act. The right of all workers to organize and bargain collectively is basic to our free enterprise system. For those who cannot work, public support should be provided on terms that insure personal dignity. I would submit comprehensive recommendations for basic reform of the entire welfare system to the next Congress, including repeal of the 1967 welfare amendments to the Social Security Act.

5. The poor should have much greater participation in the planning and administration of federal programs affecting them, including the employment of poor persons with demonstrated competence as federal employees.

In addition to these proposals, I have advocated a full education for all children, from the age of four through college, with special emphasis on services for those from disadvantaged backgrounds.

Q. Do you favor a guaranteed annual income? (National Press Club, June 20, 1968)

A. I would have to say that there hasn't been a real discussion as yet of its full meaning. But if it's what I think it is, I happen to be much more convinced that what we need is the guaranteed opportunity of a job.

I believe that people ought to earn their living.

I believe that those who are helpless and handicapped, those that are sick, those who are incapable of providing for themselves, deserve what is need for a decent living--which the present welfare laws do not provide.

But I am not one who believes in a guaranteed annual income. I prefer to put my stake in and my voice on the side of providing jobs.

Q. Can we approach the problems of the cities without focusing our attention on poverty in rural America? (Interview, Station WSAZ-TV, Huntington, West Virginia, April 28, 1968)

A. There isn't any doubt but what much of the problem of the modern city today, with its ghettos and its slums and its poverty, is due to the seedbed of poverty in the areas of rural... America. I've been Chairman of a Cabinet Committee for better than a year on what we call the urban-rural balance. This is to try to find ways and means of bringing modern technology, benefits of modern industry, jobs, recreation, education, transportation, communication, to rural America so that you make rural America attractive. So that those who live there do not feel compelled by economic necessity or cultural drought to leave the rural areas and migrate to the cities.

Q. How do you envision the future of the cities? (U. S. News & World Report, May 27, 1968)

A. The first thing we try to find out is: Can we reverse or slow down the population pressure upon the metropolitan area? Obviously, we are not going to order people to stay in a certain place. Freedom of travel, freedom of choice--where you want to work, where you want to live--are accepted facts. So, let's make that freedom of choice real.

I'm going to be talking about how we upgrade--modernize--rural America. How we build whole new communities that are living social entities. How we provide an attraction, for young people in particular, to remain in communities of 25,000; 50,000; 100,000 rather than to move to the cities of millions. I think it can be done. Government policy alone can have a great effect.

...For example, we put an environmental center in what they call the Research Triangle down in North Carolina. Look what's happened: Suddenly industries come in and a whole new area begins building up. ...

That's one of the answers. You have to have a counter-magnet to strike an urban-rural balance. ...

Nevertheless, people are in the big cities, and those cities have to be made livable. Now, my concept of the new urban America is a major city that becomes a confederation of neighborhoods. In other words, you have to have jobs and people close

together. You can have a center of excellence--the center where high finance is, where the main offices are, yes. But then you can have a whole cluster of communities around it that are not just bedroom communities, but where you have industries, libraries, public services, hospitals, medical centers, university branches, community colleges--such things in each of these neighborhoods, so that people can live and work and play and educate within a reasonable area.

We're learning that you can do these things.... What we're talking about is not new, but government as such has not encouraged this.

Q. What is the role of private capital in the rebuilding of the center city and the training and hiring of the unemployed, and how can business and government work in partnership in this enterprise? (American Management Association, June 3, 1968)

A. I think you have to treat the underdeveloped areas of America...with the same kind of philosophy and thinking...that you related to the underdeveloped areas of the world...

We guarantee loans to encourage private investment overseas. We give technical assistance. And we have gotten away from the grant idea. We have what we call the development loan fund.

Now, I think that most of the capital that we need is in the hands of the private entrepreneur, in the hands of private finance.

I want to see that capital tapped, but if I were a banker... or if I were the head of a corporation,...much as my heart would go out to the poor,...I have a responsibility to the people that invested in that business or put their money in that bank.

Therefore, if those resources are to be used, in the areas of high risk, if they are to be used with people that need specialized care and training, there must be some kind of a back-up.

And here is where the Government comes in.

I want to see developed in this country what I would call a National Urban Development Bank, along the lines of the Reconstruction

Finance Corporation, that will work with private industry where it needs matching funds from the private resources, to move in with massive amounts of capital and technical know-how, into the slum areas.

Q. Could you give us your views on how to apportion the direction of federally aided community projects among (1) the federal government, (2) state governments, (3) city or county governments, (4) neighborhood or constituent groups? (National Association for Community Development,

A. My fundamental philosophy is that community projects ought to be run by the communities they affect. America cannot hope to solve its urban or poverty problems without the initiative and full participation of the people most directly concerned. I would give top priority to developing new and imaginative ways to achieve this greater degree of community involvement.

When federal funds are involved, of course, there should be broad federal guidelines to govern their expenditure.

As for intervening levels of government, I am all for their full participation and involvement as long as they can contribute to getting the job done. At best they can be an excellent source of additional funds, guidance--and that vital ingredient in our democratic system--political support.

Occasionally, however, they are fettered by antiquated constitutions and charters, outdated procedures, and an inadequate sense of urgency. In these cases, our task must be one of sitting down with local and state officials and winning them over as supporters of effective anti-poverty community action projects.

Q. Do you have some idea, roughly, of what your program for the cities will cost? (U.S. News & World Report, May 27, 1968)

A. No. I don't think anybody does.

Furthermore, money is not the answer alone. You've got to first of all have the planners, the designers, the concept of what you want. We haven't even agreed yet in this country as to what we want out of our cities.

We've been going pell-mell. It's a sort of Band-Aid urban renewal. We go along, find a blighted spot, and we map out 25 blocks and say it's an urban-renewal district. And so you get that planned out. By the time you've gotten the planning funds and you're ready to go to work, another neighborhood--maybe 75 blocks--has become blighted.

So you see, you have to have a grand design.

Q. Obviously, this is going to take a lot of time-- (Ibid.)

A. Yes, sir.

Q. In the meanwhile, are we going to let the cities go up in flames? (Ibid.)

A. No, sir. The first thing you have to understand is the necessity of law and order, and you have to be willing to pay the price for it--which means adequate police, decentralization into neighborhood police forces, integration of police forces, proper training in human relations, the massive use of manpower rather

than at times the massive use of gun power. You have to act quickly, and then you have to offer hope. You've got to be willing to let people see that there is some light at the end of the tunnel.

Q. How do you explain this fairly new tendency to riot? (Ibid.)

A. You just have to remember that people now know that there is a better life available, that television and magazines and the like have made people understand that. The rising expectations are here, and therefore law enforcement today has to be coupled with the hope of social justice--and not only the hope, but some progress. And that's why we've got to work on these jobs for kids--good jobs, and training and education.

Q. What do you view as our present objective of the conflict in Viet Nam and the Paris talks? (Interview, Christian Science Monitor, June 24, 1968)

A. My objective--and it is also the President's objective--is a peaceful political--as opposed to a military--settlement in Vietnam. That is what we are seeking right now in Paris.

I favor--and the President favors--an immediate cease-fire in Vietnam so the killing will stop--now. Hanoi won't agree. So the Paris discussions must go on in the environment of psychological and military pressure which has become so much a standard Communist negotiating pattern.

I hope that the American people will have the patience and tenacity to withstand that pressure and to support Ambassador Averell Harriman and Cyrus Vance in Paris--no matter how long their efforts may take--and it may take a long time.

Now, one day that war will end. When it is over, I hope we will have learned some lessons from it--as I hope other nations will have learned.

The biggest lesson is that, in this nuclear age, war is simply no longer an acceptable means of attaining political ends. I hope all nations may learn that the power of reason and accommodation will have to replace the use of force.

Q. Have you ever had doubts about the war? (Interview,

Christian Science Monitor, June 24, 1968)

A. Vietnam has been tragic. Every American, not the least President Johnson, has had anguish and doubt about that war. This nation has been trapped by events of past history with which we had little to do, but which compelled us to play a role in Vietnam lest we find ourselves playing an even larger and more dangerous role in a wider area.

I have taken part in the policy discussions on Vietnam. I can tell you that the policy options have never left much room for maneuver. Nor has there been, until recently, any response by Hanoi which indicated any willingness whatever to come to the conference table.

Now when we have that chance, I do not intend to say anything which might jeopardize it. I could not as Vice President, and I would not as a private citizen.

Q. But what about your role in those policy discussions? (Ibid.)

A. /M/y views in those discussions have not always been identical with the final decisions taken. But that is equally true of all the regular participants in these discussions. This is inevitable. I have, however, as have the other participants, abided by those decisions.

Q. What do you see as the long-range picture in Southeast Asia after Vietnam? (Ibid.)

A. After a political settlement has been achieved--and I believe it finally can be--I look toward the time that all the nations of the area might join together, without respect to ideology, to meet the human needs of their citizens. We should help.

I believe we should actively build peaceful bridges to Communist China--even if they are first rebuffed--in an effort to draw the Chinese people out of their unhealthy isolation.

Beyond this, affecting Southeast Asia, but also other areas of the world, I believe we must be careful to shun any instinct to become a policeman. That means giving urgent priority to helping build international and regional organizations with a capacity for peacekeeping as well as peaceful development.

And, on an even more basic level, I believe we must give active leadership in a worldwide effort to reduce armament expenditures and to re-allocate resources to the work of development.

Finally, I think it is important--and here I am at variance with others--that we do regard Southeast Asia as important to our security. I have been there. To abdicate our responsibilities there would, I believe, be an open invitation for the same kind of trouble we have had to meet in Vietnam.

The lesson of Vietnam is not that we should pull out and abandon our role in an important part of the world. It is that

we should more clearly think out, define, and play that role before future Vietnams can happen.

Q. Do you think the United States can afford another Vietnam, can afford to send troops to counter another Communist-backed insurgency in a country of southeast Asia, Africa or Latin America? (Meet the Press, April 28, 1968)

A. I think you have to judge that on the basis of what seems to be your own national interest and your own national security. I think it would be a very unfortunate thing if a man who seeks to be President of the United States were to tell the Communist world that they could go willy-nilly, without any regard as to what America would do with its strength....

I think there is a danger of over-commitment, but I also think there is a great danger in being unwilling to commit anything. The use of power influences decision, but the absence of the use of power also influences events.

Q. You speak of building bridges to Communist China in the post-Vietnam period. How can we build bridges to such a hostile, aggressive country, and what should be the American posture with respect to the communist world? (University of Mississippi, April 25, 1968)

A. Let me use the analogy of history.

I think it is fair to say that in the immediate postwar period, the Stalinist Government of the Soviet Union was not very peaceful. It was very imperialistic. It was very militant. But nevertheless, your Government pursued the policy on the one hand of containment...but on the other hand, it sought every conceivable way to build bridges of better understanding and communication with the Soviet Union, and particularly its people, through the Cultural Exchange Program, through the Radio Free Europe, through our programs of culture and science and technology. And it has taken us almost 20 years to make the progress we have made today.

There isn't any doubt but that the central power of communism in Europe today is Moscow. But there is equally no doubt that the so-called communist monolith has been fractured, that that spirit of emancipation and nationalism and of freedom which the communist police state thought it could submerge has broken through. It is like a seed that seems to break out of the rock, and to flower....

Now, let's take a look at Asia. Peking is the center of the most militant form of Asian communism....But Asian communism is

a monolith....We know that the government in Peking is anything but friendly and conducive to this kind of thinking. But governments come and governments go. Who could ever have predicted what has happened in Czechoslovakia? ...in the Soviet Union?...in Rumania?...

I submit that time erodes even the worst of these institutions. And it is our job to use that time...

I think that in the contest of ideas, that we have no reason to fear which idea will prevail. I know we have no reason at all....

There is today in China a revolution. We know very little about it. It is our job, as people in government and in this economy, to try to find ways and means, once again, of establishing contact with a great people, the Chinese people, who, 20 years ago, were great friends of the United States. The children of those families have been taught to hate the United States.

I think we ought to try to contact those children; we ought to do everything we can; we ought to be as ingenious as we can, to try to repair that imbalance. That is what I mean by building bridges. Trade, cultural exchanges, scientists, journalists, writers, actors, drama people. We can do it, and we had better make up our minds to get it done.

We are either going to learn to live with them, or some of us are going to die with them. And I am for living.

Q. What do you think generally of the role of today's youth in the present times of turbulence and social change?

(University of Maine, May 17, 1968)

A. How many people in this audience know that last year 400,000 university students gave freely of their time in charity work to the inner-city youth?...This is another instance of what I call the volunteer generation. You generally hear about some of the things that are not too good. There isn't a person of my age in this room or any place else that can match what this generation of young people is doing in terms of community service and social concern. It has been students who helped...break the back of segregation and discrimination. There are thousands of students today who are working at neighborhood youth centers....You still have a lot of work to do, and I hope that if you feel that you have to protest you will go out and find somebody you can help, somebody who needs a little guidance and attention, some kid that never had a break, someone who should be encouraged to stay in school instead of being a drop-out, find some place you can go to work to help even the scales of justice a little bit and help us make sure this country is not two societies, black and white, separate and unequal. Help us make this country what it ought to be and what you and I want it to be--a united country, a united country in spirit, not necessarily in every word, not necessarily in every thought, but in spirit, a united country that is dedicated to human betterment.

Q. Do you see reason to be optimistic about the future of this country? (Interview, Christian Science Monitor, April 16, 1968)

A. It takes a lot of will to do a lot of things. I don't think we are drifting. We have been buffeted. But we have not as yet lost our sense of direction. There is a very definite sense of direction....The civil rights movement, business community, churches, college presidents, joined in getting the Civil Rights Bill....The House passed the recent Civil Rights Bill after it had been languishing for weeks. This is an expression of American will. We sell ourselves short. We ought not to. We expose our weaknesses, and maybe this is a sign of our health. Only the strong dare to discuss their weaknesses.

Q. If you were President, what would be your first priorities? (Interview, Christian Science Monitor, June 24, 1968)

A. The relaxation of tensions and emphasis on reconciliation and peaceful social /and/ economic development. That goes for the world, and for our own country....

So-called civilized society has been around for a long time. It never will be truly civilized until nations, and people, stop building fences, stop stocking weapons, stop settling their disputes by force.

I've gone through life branded as either an impatient young man or a visionary....I mean to put that impatience and that vision together. And that means getting down to the hard work, right now, with the Soviet Union and, in the future, Communist China, of reducing the tensions that increasingly take our resources for the wrong things....

And we have to do the same thing right here in America--I mean getting down to the things that really count. I reject the notion that we have to be two nations, black and white--or two nations, North and South--or two nations, rich and poor. No responsible person wants that. There is a vast, silent group of Americans--a majority of many millions--that wants to make this country work, that wants safety and equal rights for everyone, that bears no ill will against other Americans.

I think this silent America--an America still unaroused--can be aroused. I mean to try. That is why I went to the Poor

People's March--to build bridges, to show fortunate Americans that many of the claims of the poor are legitimate, and to show the poor that they are not shut off from the leadership of this nation, that the democratic system can work.

So I would set to work, on my very first day in office, to pull this country together, and then, to see if we couldn't pull the world a little closer back to sanity and peace.

Q. If you were elected President, could the country expect a continuation of the trends and policies that we have known in the Johnson Administration? (U.S. News & World Report, May 27, 1968)

A. If a man is elected President, he puts his own imprint upon the country, upon the office that he occupies, and upon the policies that he enunciates and pursues.

There is in this country a degree of continuity. I have served in the Kennedy-Johnson Administration as majority whip in the Senate and in the Johnson-Humphrey Administration as Vice President. The policies that we pursued, in the main, have had my active support, but I do not say that they are the alpha and omega. They are not Holy Writ. We would build on those policies. We would judge them and evaluate them....

The task of a President is to lead, and to lead means to persuade, to mobilize. It means that you get others to come with you, to stand in a front-line phalanx that moves ahead.

(National Press Club, June 20, 1968)

If I am permitted to be President of the United States, I intend to be President. I've noticed that most Presidents are just that. They really don't take orders from Vice Presidents or from anybody else.

And if I have the opportunity to lead this country, there will be my ideas as I glean them also from others, as I tap

Draft

Last week I spoke to you about one of the campaign's major issues: how to achieve peace in Viet Nam.

I spelled out my views on how I would proceed if a cease fire and fruitful negotiations had not been achieved when I assumed the Presidency on January 20, 1969.

I ~~explained~~ spelled out how I would stop the bombing as a step toward peace -- a risk fully within our national interest-- and I laid down my proposals for a cease-fire, for de-Americanization of the war, and for free elections in South Viet Nam with all factions ~~part~~ participating.

Tonight I want to talk with you frankly about the second major issue of the campaign -- one that has yet to be discussed openly and honestly -- the issue of crime and the black problem.

My record~~xxx~~ and my credentials on the issue of civil rights are well-known. All my life I have fought to assure every American the right to make the most he can of himself.

Standing proudly on this record, I am ready for some straight talk tonight -- to whites and blacks alike -- on this sensitive, even explosive, subject.

Today more people are earning more money and living more comfortably than ever before in American history.

Unemployment is at a 15 year low.

Per-capita income is at an all-time high.

Record numbers of young Americans are attending college -- and their futures never looked brighter.

Our older citizens have the security of medicare.

Yet, in this time of unprecedented prosperity and domestic progress, Americans are gripped by a deep sense of fear and anxiety over the question of crime and violence.

2.

Husbands ~~XXXXXX~~ worry over the safety of their wives and children~~x~~.

Mothers are afraid to leave ~~the~~ their homes after dark -- or to take their children to public parks during the day.

Families fear for the security of their homes and neighborhoods.

I understand these fears about crime and personal safety. And I know that the next President must do everything in his power to fight crime and violence -- and to bring about a new sense of personal security so that families may live in safety and enjoy fully the rewards of their labors.

For many white Americans, the source of their deep personal anxiety is fear of black Americans.

~~XXXXXXXXXX~~

In their mind most street muggings and assaults are committed by blacks.

They hear the black extremists like Rap Brown or Stokely Carmichael preaching violence and hate.

They see on TV or in their newspapers the lurid accounts of riots, fire-bombing and sniping in the black neighborhoods, of our cities.

It is this growing fear of crime and violence -- especially concern for one's personal safety -- combined with the fear of black ~~XXM~~ Americans that has become the overriding, but until now, the largely unstated domestic issue of this campaign.

Above all else, a candidate for President must be honest with the American people. And the American people must be equally honest with themselves.

3.

You must squarely face the question: What do you want done?

I don't think many white Americans seriously advocate taking all black citizens and sending them back to Africa or rounding them up and putting them in concentration camps.

Most white Americans are decent, fair-minded people who are quite willing to give everyone a fair chance to succeed in life. But today many of these same fair-minded people -- people who supported recent civil rights legislation to end two centuries of discrimination -- are fearful of crime and fearful of blacks. And the result is fear, tension, frustration and violence.

Let's keep on being honest with ourselves. The city of _____, for example, has a Negro population of approximately _____. Of this number, about _____ blacks have never been inside a jail. In other words, about _____ percent of them are law-abiding citizens -- just as you and I are.

More than that, about _____ percent of those Negroes have never received a welfare check.

There are, however, about _____ who carry guns, knives, and other weapons. They have broken the law -- committed robberies, assaults and other criminal acts.

So it is these _____, not the _____, who must be brought to justice. This pattern is repeated in city after city across this nation.

One additional fact: The law-abiding majority of the blacks are just as anxious as anybody for better law enforcement. They should be -- ~~XX~~ FBI figures show that Negro citizens are the principal victims of crimes committed by Negro law breakers.

4.

And they don't like black radicals -- the Carmichaels and Rap Browns -- any more than you and I do. Because they know those men would start riots -- and the first homes burned and the first stores looted would be Negro homes and Negro stores.

Honesty also compels one more comment: Much of the recent increase in crime has occurred outside predominantly Negro neighborhoods. Suburban crime, for example, is sharply on the increase -- and here the criminals have often turned out to be white teenagers, many from homes and backgrounds where poverty or lack of education are unknown.

We must be honest with ourselves -- both as to the fears which grip many Americans today -- and as to the real sources of crime and violence in America.

Only if we face facts can we hope to get results.

My two principal opponents in this campaign have played heavily on the issue of crime and the black problem.

The third party candidate, George Corley Wallace -- until he chose General Curtis LeMay for his Vice-Presidential candidate, and thus raised the public's concern over nuclear war -- had talked of little else but crime and the black problem.

George Wallace has appealed directly to these fears and emotions felt by so many of our white citizens. He has said he would take care of criminals and law-breakers. But he has never told us how -- except to hint that he would run over them with a car.

I have already spoken out against these tactics of George Wallace -- and I intend to keep speaking out. ^{Because I reject the} ~~rightist~~ extremism he represents just as firmly as I reject the leftist extremism of the Carmichaels and Rap Browns. And I am confident that most Americans reject them too.

George Wallace governed a state with the highest murder rate in the nation; a state that ranked, according to the FBI, number _____ in aggravated assaults. Could you trust him to make good on his

5.

boasts and promises?

My Republican opponent, Richard Nixon, has followed much the same course as George Wallace, although he has used more careful language. In the North he has mentioned the need for social justice as well as law and order. But in Strom Thurmond's South, he speaks very softly, if at all, of social justice. And he too has refused to face up to the more difficult task of telling the American people how he intends to make our streets safe and our neighborhoods secure.

Last week, for example, he released a statement on crime. It contained four major recommendations.

Mr. Nixon's advisors forgot to tell him that three of his recommendations -- a "cabinet-level council" to coordinate Federal policy on the control and prevention of crime, a National Coordinating Center, and a National Academy of Law Enforcement -- were already part of the Federal Government's program to fight crime.

The only new recommendation made by Mr. Nixon -- the only recommendation he had not copied from existing programs -- was to suggest a series of nationwide town hall conferences on crime prevention.

This sounds like either a call for the vigilantes or for more talk about crime.

America doesn't need either one. The time for talking is over -- we need action. And we don't need vigilantes. We need more resources in the fight against crime.

And on this Mr. Nixon stands as silent as he stands on how he would get peace in Vietnam.

6

Now how do I propose to fight crime and prevent crime in this ~~the~~ country?

Soon after I was ~~was~~ elected mayor of Minneapolis, ~~in 1935~~ I came to Washington to ask the advice of J. Edgar Hoover about cleaning up ~~the~~ Minneapolis--a city gripped by a wave of organized crime.

Mr. Hoover gave me some good advice--get the best man you can for police chief and then give him all the support he needs. ~~He recommended~~ I followed his recommendation for chief and I went back to Minneapolis to get the people behind him.

I rode around the city at night in patrol cars with our police officers. I ~~was~~ went with them ~~when they closed down~~ ~~in~~ gambling houses and illegal bars whose operators had always been able to buy ~~somebody~~ ^{off} somebody.

I doubled police salaries--and ^I told the officers I expected first-class work at all times.

We didn't finish the job overnight. It wasn't easy. I was even shot at twice by hoodlums who didn't appreciate the heat.

But we ran the ~~the~~ racketeers out of town and we laid the ~~the~~ foundations for a decent city for all people--and I'm still proud of this record.

Got results in Minneapolis. And I'll get results as
I intend to do the same thing as President of the United States. I intend to get results.

~~21~~

But I also intend to be honest. No President
~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~
 can promise that crime will be ended. It ~~xx~~ never has
 been. But crime can be reduced greatly by the swift,
 sure and equal administration of ~~xxx~~ criminal
 justice.

Criminal justice is a three-step justice. It
 begins with the police. It proceeds with the courts.
 It ends--if the defendant is guilty--in prison.

First, your local ^{policeman} ~~police~~ need help desperately.
 We give these brave men one of the most important jobs
 in society. Then we pay them on the average of two-thirds
 of what is necessary to support a family in moderate
 circumstances.

As my first act as President of the United
 States, I intend to re-allocate the necessary funds
 --estimated to be approximately \$300 million--to
 bring police salaries up to the FBI level. I think
 this is the most direct and effective way to demonstrate
 to every American that a Humphrey-Muskie Administration
 means business.

Your local police need better professional training.
 Here the Federal Government has ~~xx~~ made a start, but
 more must be done.

22

Your local police need better technical equipment such as automatic fingerprint identification systems, ~~xxxx~~ radio and ~~xxx~~ other communication equipment, especially for foot patrolmen, and fast computerized information systems.

As President, I will direct the federal government to help local police forces acquire this equipment.

Second, we have our courts. We hear from some that they are the causes of crime. . . or that they condone it.

Let's face the truth. Where our courts fail, they do so primarily ~~xx~~ for one reason: they are understaffed, overworked and overcrowded.

In some cities two years pass before an arraigned man is brought to trial. Some of these people are dangerous criminals ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ and should be brought ^{swiftly} to justice. If the courts could handle their work load, they would be.

The federal government can help--and at modest cost--by helping ~~xxx~~ law ^y schools train more prosecutors, public defenders, and other court officers and by advising local courts on the use of modern computerized equipment.

Third, prisons.

When 75 percent of all people arrested prove to be repeaters, ~~xxxxx~~ these institutions are not providing

9
~~47~~
adequate correction.

Too often our prisons provide only custody, not rehabilitation.

Too often, they are not institutions designed to help as many prisoners as possible and to protect society ~~gx~~ against the rest--not institutions to provide work and education--but merely schools for crime.

As President, I would propose that the Federal Government provide assistance to our state and local correctional ~~institutions~~ institutions. We can ~~and we~~ ~~will~~ rehabilitate those offenders who can return to society to lead ~~productive~~ productive ~~lives~~ lives free ~~from crime~~. And we will protect the ~~public~~ public from those we cannot cure. *reclaim*

I would also expand the Federal Government's attack on organized crime. The active participation of business and labor--increasingly the target of organized crime--must be enlisted in halting the growing influence of this pervasive form of crime in America.

~~Since~~ Federal, state, and local agencies must be organized in a massive effort to stop the drug traffic in this country.

This means an increase in enforcement personnel.

~~It means stiffer penalties for violation of the~~

10
Z
~~laws prohibiting the unlicensed sale of drugs.~~

It means a large scale program for treating drug addition and for rehabilitating the victims of addiction once the habit is broken.

Finally, rioting in American cities must end.

If there is looting and burning, ~~it must be treated and punished according to the laws against sealing and arson.~~
it must be treated and punished according to the laws against sealing and arson.

As President, I would provide additional ~~training~~ training for National Guard units in riot control, teamwork and planning.

I would maintain small, highly-trained National Guard riot control units on ~~continual~~ continual alert, for short-term service in any community.

And I would stand ready to respond to any legitimate call from states or cities for military manpower in the event of massive disorders.

These are the specific actions I would take as President to help us build a society of order and justice.

I think there is in the American people enough courage to resist appeals to fear--enough compassion to reject repression--and enough wisdom to ignore the ~~demagogues~~ demagogues.

America has serious problems. But ~~America~~ America

11
SP
has millions of decent people, white and black,
millions of decent youngsters, millions of people who
want to live together in peace and reconciliation
in the land we love.

It is to those million that I appeal.

It is in them I put my faith.

Crime is not a black problem. . . or a white
problem. Crime is an American problem ^{for} ~~to~~
be solved by ^{all} the ~~the~~ American people.

We have laws--and if I am President they will
be enforced.

We need order--and if I am President we will have
order.

And we need ^{individual} liberty--and if I am President we
will have ~~the~~ liberty too.

The great work of civilization has always been
to maintain order in society and at the same time
~~to~~ safeguard individual liberty.

What is at stake in this ~~Presidential~~ Presidential
election is the quality of American life for years to
come.

It is the greatest political system on earth.

It is the noblest freest social system yet devised.

If the ~~the~~ voices of bigotry and fear prevail,
we can lose everything we have labored so hard to build.

~~CH~~

I can offer you no easy solutions.. There are none.

I offer you no hiding place. There is none.

I can offer you only this--my credo--the words
of that great American patriot Nathan Hale:

"I am only one but I am one. I cannot do everything
but I can do something. And what I can do, that I
ought to do, And what I ought to do, by the
grace of God, I ~~xx~~ shall do."

Thank you and good night.

Thursday AM RELEASE

VP - TV SPOT

~~ROBERT ROSENBERG~~

~~SUMMARY~~ There's a vast group of Americans today -- a majority of many, many millions who want to make this country work and who love this country. They are the non-violent majority. And they come from all segments of America -- black and white, rich and poor, young and old.

They want safety, and they want equal rights for everyone. They bear no ill will against other Americans. They want change, but they want it without violence. They don't want it clubbed into people. They don't want it bulldozed through by a handful who shout down all opposition.

That handful has occupied center stage lately in American politics. I've seen what they represent, and I do not like it. It is opposed to the true American spirit. I saw it in Minneapolis when George Wallace was interrupted by demonstrations and fist-fighting. I firmly reject Mr. Wallace's point of view, but we must all defend his right to talk without fear or intimidation.

I saw it at the Republican convention in 1964, when Nelson Rockefeller was shouted down by a small, hostile group. And I saw it on the Fourth of July when a loud, rude clique tried to drown me out with chants and jeers as I spoke for free speech at Philadelphia's Independence Hall.

And we've all seen it in the ^Mdisruptions of great universities and city streets by a violent few who exploited needed reforms. Now,

they claim to represent the spirit of change in America, but I believe that the true wellspring of change is in the great, non-violent majority.

I believe they are ready to speak out again, so on their behalf I challenge those whose minds are so closed they will not listen to any point of view but their own. The great, non-violent majority of Americans believe in the right of the minority to be heard, so why won't the few give the majority the same right?

The unique success of the United States is grounded in the fact that this is one country in which a man does not need to riot in order to reach the platform. And when he gets there, he does not need to shout in order to be heard.

I know this is true because I have been heard. I've tried to speak for the majority who want orderly change within the democratic process, and I've done so for more than twenty years, and I've helped make things change without violence.

I introduced the first fair employment practices in this country. I proposed Medicare, the Job Corps, the Peace Corps, Food for Peace, federal aid to education, and more civil rights legislation than I have time to tell you about.

And now, as we look ahead, I have new ideas -- ideas to bring needed change without violence. A Marshall Plan to rebuild our cities. A guaranteed education plan from pre-school through college. A plan to spread the burden of military service more fairly. And a plan to stop the dangerous arms race. A program for civil order and a civil

justice.

These are proposals to do jobs that need doing. And if I'm elected President, I will act on them. I will act on them because I believe in them to be the desires of the majority of Americans, the majority who believe in their country and love it, who obey its laws, who pay its taxes, who hope and work for better things, for needed change without violence.

Now, if you count yourself amongst these Americans, I would like to speak for you.

ACKLEY-SCHULTZE RECEPTION

Gardner Ackley and Charlie Schultze, now that you are leaving us, I am telling all my friends that the nation is in your debt -- not ours.

I don't know whether the New Economics will prove as "dismal" as the old, but it is just as thankless.

This morning I asked a friend of mine in the Congress what he thought of Charlie Schultze. He said: "He just can't cut a budget. What's worse, he was against my rivers-and-harbors project."

-2-

At lunch I asked a labor-leader friend about Gardner Ackley. He said: "He can take his guideposts...." Needless to say, I assured him, Gardner, that you had.

Now it was your job to please all of the people all of the time, and let me tell you frankly that you have both been dismal failures in that regard.

* * *

More seriously, we are here tonight to thank and pay tribute to you both for trying to find the right answers, for finding a great many, and for not being afraid to say you didn't have them all.

Together you have helped give this country a new notion of prosperity, and new opportunities to meet its responsibilities at home and abroad.

I know we can count on both of you for guidance in the future as we seek to apply that prosperity and seize those opportunities for the betterment of mankind.

#

HUMPHREY SPEAKER'S KIT

ORDER AND JUSTICE

The title of this talk is important. It is "Order and Justice" --not "Law and Order."

That may seem a silly thing to argue about, but in a real way it cuts to the heart of this election. The choice this year is between a campaign of empty appeals to fear and prejudice and a campaign of constructive proposals for action in the name of Justice.

Richard Nixon has admitted publicly that in many quarters "law and order" has become a code phrase for low-keyed racist appeals. Yet it remains the central theme of the Republican--as well as the Wallace--campaign.

And it has become the special favorite of the Republican Vice Presidential nominee--over the public protest of his party's sole major Negro figure, Senator Brooke of Massachusetts.

This theme of fear, with its clear but unstated undertone of repression and control of the black minority is the product of the

Republican Party's compact with extremism and reaction. This compact was signed in full view of the American people in Miami Beach, when the party's reactionary and segregationist elements--led by Strom Thurmond--dictated the choice of a nominee and a strategy.

Fear--as Mr. Nixon well knows--is an easy product to sell. But let us examine this campaign of fear and put it in perspective with some facts.

We hear a lot from Mr. Nixon about the increase in crime rates since 1961, when President Kennedy took office. The clever implication--never fully stated--is that the Democrats are responsible for this development, or have condoned it.

The "new" Nixon then tells us in hushed, dramatic tones of law-abiding American citizens afraid to walk the streets at night. The Republicans, we are told, will set all this straight; safety and snug security will return to the streets and homes of America if only Nixon is in the White House.

Such is the campaign of fear. The facts, however, cut both

Order and Justice--3

ways. Crime control is, as we all know, primarily a local and state responsibility. Yet in the five states which have had Republican governors continuously since 1960, the amount of crime has risen 170 per cent--more than twice the national average. Of the 15 states with the highest crime rates in 1967, 13 had Republican governors. Governor Agnew's Maryland had by far the highest rate of violent crime in the country in 1967, and violent crime rose 52.5 per cent during his first year in office. And the highest murder rate in the country is found in George Wallace's Alabama.

These figures do not, of course, indicate that Republicans are "soft on crime." The only thing they prove is that crime is entirely nonpartisan. Crime is not committed by governors or legislators, Presidents or parties.

Nor is it committed by judges. Demagogic attacks on our courts and on individual Supreme Court Justices constitute a strange way to encourage respect for the law. More important, they are based upon a complete distortion of the facts.

The Supreme Court has not "handcuffed" the police; it has upheld "stop and frisk" practices, limited electronic surveillance, photograph and fingerprint identifications, blood tests, fairly conducted interrogations, and other means of combating crime. It has merely decided to affirm the clear mandate of fairness in our Bill of Rights, and to give to all Americans some of the means to defend themselves which rich and powerful defendants have always enjoyed.

The FBI has for years been operating under the rules which the Court has now imposed on all law enforcement agencies, and the FBI remains our most effective weapon against crime.

Mr. Nixon and Mr. Wallace seek to inflame and exploit the fear of violent attack on the street. But almost three-fourths of the violent crimes in this country are committed by persons known to the victims. They are not the work of marauding bands of outlaws; they are the product of personal passions and tensions, unleashed in part by the frustration and desperation of people chained to poverty and slums.

What solutions do the merchants of fear offer to the problem of crime? They do not offer hard analysis or concrete programs to control crime or to eliminate its causes. They offer changes in the personnel of the Supreme Court. And they offer tough talk. But tough talk without hard thought leads only to repressive, police-state methods.

What do Hubert Humphrey and the Democrats offer? Hubert Humphrey has presented a specific, carefully thought-out, 86-point crime control program.

First, Humphrey offers support and assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies--real support in the form of money. Our police are handcuffed, all right, but not by Supreme Court decisions. They are handcuffed by a crippling shortage of manpower, by low salaries, by a lack of training, by the desperate need for modern scientific equipment, by a lack of cooperative mechanisms for the collection and exchange of law enforcement information. We ask our police to perform society's most dangerous tasks, without the necess-

ary technical and human assistance. And we ask them to do it on an average salary which provides only two-thirds of what an average family needs to live modestly.

Where do the Republicans stand? They crippled every provision in the federal Crime Control Act of 1968 for grants to states and localities for these purposes.

The Democrats offer financial and research assistance to local criminal courts, struggling under staggering backlogs which delay trials, dilute the quality of justice and waste the valuable time of police officers, among others.

Where do the Republicans stand? They attack court decisions, instead of attacking the problems of the courts.

The Democrats offer financial and research assistance to states and localities to improve penal systems, to help rehabilitate offenders and to hire badly needed parole officers. Violent crime is largely the work of repeaters; our correctional systems are failures; our prisons are really schools for crime.

Order and Justice--7

Where do the Republicans stand? They cry out only for stiffer sentences--and nothing more.

The Democrats offer strict gun control laws, to cut down on the thousands of murders, suicides, robberies and street crimes which could never take place if guns were not freely available to even the most tragically unstable members of society. An American dies of gunshot wounds every 30 minutes, and most of the policemen killed in action are murdered with guns.

Where do the Republicans stand? They have consistently led the opposition which has stifled effective gun control action in Congress.

The Democrats offer a vigorous assault on organized crime, a multi-billion dollar business which bilks the poor and "leans on" the honest businessman. In fiscal 1967 the Justice Department obtained 1,166 indictments against accused gangsters, and the pace of the attack has been stepped up for 1968.

Where do the Republicans stand? They have viciously attacked the Attorney General, but in 1960 under the last Republican Attorney

Order and Justice--8

General, a total of only 16 organized crime indictments were brought.

Most important of all, the Democrats offer a total national commitment to social justice.

Hubert Humphrey and the Democratic Party have pledged to mobilize the financial, technical and human resources of this nation to eliminate the discrimination, poverty, hunger and illiteracy which breed despair. And Despair in the midst of abundance is the seedbed of bitterness, violence and crime.

The Democrats have been honest with the American people. They have said that this commitment is a big and expensive one, but that it is one we cannot afford to refuse.

Where do the Republicans stand. They have voted against every program, from Model Cities to rat control, designed to alleviate blight and despair in our cities. Richard Nixon rejects the expenditures necessary to achieve social justice. His party has even led the fight to cut funds from Project Head Start.

Of course Democrats are for firm and fair enforcement of the

Order and Justice--9

law. But we do not believe that the way to achieve it is to join forces with those who for years preached open defiance of the law of the land in the name of racial segregation.

We know--and you know--that true order will not be established until the achievement of social justice gives every American a stake in the preservation of this society.

Hubert Humphrey is running for President, not for policechief.

That is why our campaign is about "Order and Justice."

"Order and Justice" is not for Hubert Humphrey a new slogan thought up to exploit a national mood and win an election. It is the theme of a political lifetime.

When Hubert Humphrey became Mayor of Minneapolis, it was one of the crime capitals of the nation. He did not run for office by exploiting the fears of the people. He campaigned for office on a platform of racial equality, and as Mayor he established a Human Relations Council, a Fair Employment Practices Commission, and councils to promote police-community relations.

He also worked day and night with his police for firm, fair law enforcement, and doubled the salaries of his policemen. He drove the gangsters out, and when he left office, Minneapolis enjoyed interracial harmony.

Where was Richard Nixon during the 1940s and 1950s, when his party was cutting taxes and smothering Democratic attempts to face up to this nation's social responsibilities? He was out leading another campaign of fear, in which thousands of loyal Americans were tarred with the brush of communism and subversion. The only "new" thing about the "new Nixon" is that he has found a new fear to exploit.

Where was Hubert Humphrey during those years? He was in the United States Senate, pressing for legislation on civil rights, housing, education, food stamps, and a whole host of other measures to open the doors of opportunity in this country to all Americans.

Hard work is not very dramatic. And it is not as easy as the exploitation of public fear. But this country and the Democratic Party have faced down the merchants of fear before.

Order and Justice--11

A fearful, defensive nation can only turn inward upon itself and tear itself apart--the question is only one of time. Such a course goes against the grain of the American people.

Courage, compassion and commitment are needed--on the part of the voters as well as the leaders. If I know the American people, they are not ready to give in to the darkness of fear. They stand ready to carry on the fight for justice.

HUMPHREY SPEAKER'S KIT

HUMPHREY-NIXON CAMPAIGN

I want to get down now to the nitty-gritty of what this election is all about.

Some of us are Democrats. Others of us are Republicans.

All of us are Americans. When we go into the voting booth every four years, we confront for an instant in nonpartisan solitude the ultimate question of who shall be the next President of the United States.

Choosing a President is always serious business, and that is perhaps why election-year speakers uniformly paint a picture of unique national crisis. Sadly for this nation, however, the crisis we face today is not unique in our history.

Ever since our white ancestors brought the first boatload of our black ancestors to these shores in chains, we have been forced periodically to decide whether we are one people, or whether we are divided--North and South, black and white, rich and poor.

Our answer to that question has always been, ultimately, the same. In 1860, America placed its trust and hope in a man who declared that "a House divided against itself cannot stand." Abraham Lincoln stood like a tower of patience and wisdom, "with firmness in the right as God [gave him] to see the right". This country decided, in a bitter and bloody civil war, that it was to be "one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Like the America of 1860, the America of 1968 cannot escape from the repeated question of our national heritage. And as we choose a President in 1968, we would do well to reflect upon the qualities of the man we chose in 1860.

Imagine, if you can, an Abraham Lincoln refurbished with a "new image" every four years. Picture, if you are able, Abraham Lincoln escorted to the podium to accept his party's nomination by Strom Thurmond--the only major racist candidate for President before George Wallace.

What would the first and greatest of Republican Presidents think today of his party's "Southern Strategy," of its open wooing of the Wallaceites? How would this great man, who governed "with malice toward none, with charity for all," view the empty, repressive campaign of fear being waged by his party's candidates in the name of "law and order"--a phrase admitted by Mr. Nixon to be a code word for racist appeals--a phrase which Mr. Agnew has stubbornly refused to drop--a phrase in which there is no room for the justice delayed and denied since Mr. Lincoln's time?

The question is not whether Mr. Nixon is personally a racist. He is not. The question is--where does Mr. Nixon stand on this question of justice for all Americans?

Are we to believe the Richard Nixon who said in 1952--before the invention of the Southern Strategy--"if a State did not adopt a system which did provide equal opportunities and equal facilities, then the federal

government in that instance would deny federal aid. I recognize that this involves an element of federal control, but I believe that this control is essential"?

Or are we to believe the Richard Nixon who told a Southern television hook-up in 1968--while going for the Wallace vote--that while he agrees with the school desegregation decision of 1954, local Southern school boards which have defied it for years should be free of federal influence, and that denying federal funds to enforce the constitutional mandate of desegregation is a "dangerous" course?

Is it so difficult to imagine Abraham Lincoln asking the 1948 Democratic convention--as Hubert Humphrey did--to get out of the shadow of states' rights and walk forthrightly into the bright sunshine of human rights."

No one has ever had to guess where Hubert Humphrey stands on the central issue of our times--not since he first ran for local office on a platform of racial equality and arrived in the United States Senate with a

pocketful of civil rights bills in 1948.

There is no hidden meaning or negative connotation to Humphrey's campaign slogan--"order and justice." He does not seek to ride a crest of fear to the pinnacle of power. He continues his lifelong appeal to the courage and compassion of the American people.

He faces the problem of crime and offers a strong program of specific crime control measures. But he has made it crystal clear that we cannot achieve true order in this country until we achieve true social justice. He has told us that we cannot be one people until we create equal opportunity for all, and that the job will be difficult and expensive. And he has told us forthrightly that if we refuse that commitment, we cannot hope to preserve our heritage of liberty.

This contrast between the candidates is not confined to the problem of human rights and equal opportunity; it extends along the entire spectrum of public interest.

Are we to believe the Richard Nixon who declared in the 1950's that the Republican Party "would lose its self-respect and right to exist if it ever compromised on this basic issue of human rights" or the one who led that party in the 1960's into a compact with Strom Thurmond?

. . . The Richard Nixon who talks of rebuilding our cities, or the one who categorically opposes the expenditures necessary to that task?

. . . The Richard Nixon who talks of health care and jobs and social security, or the one who opposed Medicare and housing and increased Social Security coverage and benefits while he was in Congress?

. . . The Richard Nixon who proclaims sympathy for the cause of labor today, or the one who campaigned for years against the unions, tarring them with the brush of communism?

. . . The Richard Nixon who talks glibly of the right to collective bargaining, or the one who pushed Taft-Hartley to passage over

President Truman's veto, who opposes repeal of 14-b and who has appointed two of the most flagrant perpetrators of anti-union unfair labor practices as key advisers in this campaign?

. . . The Richard Nixon who promises the farmer a full share in American prosperity, or the one who gave his full support to the disastrous policies of Ezra Taft Benson?

. . . The Richard Nixon who now claims to support conservation, or the one who always voted in Congress to reduce conservation appropriations?

. . . The Richard Nixon who praises rural electrification, or the one who pleased his private-power backers by voting time after time to cut REA funds?

Are we to believe the Richard Nixon who viciously attacked Adlai Stevenson's proposal of a test-ban treaty in the 1956 campaign as "catastrophic nonsense," or the one who heaped lavish praise on Republican efforts to carry out the suggestion soon after the election?

. . . The Richard Nixon who today praises the Peace Corps as a foreign policy success, or the one who shot from the hip in 1960 and blasted it as a "haven for draft dodgers"?

. . . The Richard Nixon who said in 1956 that "our foreign aid is not designed to buy the friendship of peoples in countries to which our aid is given," or the one who said in 1966 that "foreign aid is one of the most powerful instruments we have to reward our friends and punish our enemies"?

Hubert Humphrey is consistent and explicit in his record and statements on these and all issues.

Humphrey introduced and put through the most important civil rights measures in our history.

He has proposed a Marshall Plan for the Cities and a Urban Development Bank to finance the rebuilding of urban America.

Humphrey introduced or co-sponsored Medicare, the Job Corps, regional development, food stamps, aid to education, increased Social Security benefits, and many other measures to improve the lot of all American

He has stood shoulder to shoulder with American labor in its great legislative battles.

Humphrey has voted for high parity price supports, effective programs to reduce farm surpluses, increased conservation efforts, rural electrification, and more loans for our family farmers.

He proposed disarmament initiatives--including the test ban treaty--in the 1950's and has worked patiently and successfully for them ever since. Humphrey introduced the Peace Corps legislation in 1960, and has consistently supported foreign aid to assist less developed countries to harness their human and economic resources.

Yes, there is only one Humphrey on the basic issues facing America, but we can not even confine our search for the "real" Nixon to the "old" and "new" versions. There are several running around to choose from today.

There is the Nixon who thinks Abe Fortas is "eminently qualified"

to be Chief Justice--and the one who thinks President Johnson shouldn't have appointed him.

There is the Nixon who opposes filibusters--and the one who won't urge his party's Senators to let the Fortas appointment come to a vote.

There is the Nixon who says he favors the nuclear nonproliferation treaty, and the one who opposes ratifying it now.

Then there is the Nixon who proudly took his case to the people in every uncontested Republican primary in the country--and the one who won't take it to the people in televised debates now that there is an opponent in the field.

Again, we find but one Hubert Humphrey. He is for the confirmation of Justice Fortas. He is for ratifying the treaty in the name of international sanity--now. He is for televised debates. Period. It is possible to disagree with Hubert Humphrey, but never to wonder where he stands.

Are we prepared to bestow our nation's highest honor and the

dignity of its most cherished office upon a man who began his political career with two of the dirtiest campaigns in recent history? He is the man who tossed the ugly word "traitor" at a President of the United States, and who cast aspersions on the loyalty of every opponent he faced until even he caught on that the American people condemned that kind of mudslinging.

I mention the old Nixon campaigns, not because a man should be denied public office in 1968 for something he did in 1952, but because they are a key to the "real" Nixon. The "new" Nixon has merely found a new way to exploit the darkest fears of a troubled people. It is not a question of the "old Nixon" or the "new Nixon." What we see today is the same Nixon, dressed up in a slick new package--a package designed on Wall Street and put together on Madison Avenue. And that new package is as empty of real substance as the old one was.

The record of Hubert Humphrey stands in stark contrast for all

Americans to see. His path to power is not strewn with the victims of slander. While Richard Nixon was out honing his newest campaign techniques, Hubert Humphrey was engaged in the hard work of legislation, learning the difficult tasks of government. Hubert Humphrey today does not appeal to the fears of America--but to its courage.

So let us focus again on that moment of nonpartisan solitude in the voting booth. An election is like a camera. In that instant we must ask ourselves what kind of man we want to be President of the United States. The moment can never be relived--the choice can never be re-made. In that instant the raw nerve ends of a nation's concerns are exposed for all to see. This year, will America in that instant show its fear--or its courage?

How will history judge our performance? Will it be recorded that November 5, 1968, marked the date when America lost its nerve, gave up on its noble experiment and gave in to the subtle merchants of fear and hatred and division and repression?

Or will it be written that on that day America honored its tradition of courage and compassion and unity and liberty, and decided, once and for all, that it was one nation? The choice is in your hands.

HUMPHREY SPEAKER'S KIT

THE ECONOMY

There was a big sign at the Democratic National Convention which read, "Promises Made . . . Promises Kept." That is the theme truth of Democratic performance in strengthening the economy.

In 1960 John Kennedy and the Democratic Party saw an economy sluggish and stagnant after eight long years of Republican indifference . . . and they promised to get this country moving again. They did.

After three dangerous and crippling recessions during the Republican Administration, this country has enjoyed seven and a half years--90 months--of unbroken economic growth. That is the longest such period on record.

In 1960 our rate of economic growth was so slow that we

were seriously worried by Khrushchev's threat to "bury" us economically.

Under the Democrats | our rate of growth has more than doubled. The Russians don't talk about burying us any more.

In 1960 we were afraid of our own technology. Our rate of unemployment was so high and automation posed such a threat that we were seriously discussing an artificially short work week and early retirement to spread the shrinking number of jobs around.

Vigorous economic expansion under the Democrats has once again turned American ingenuity into an ally, instead of a foe.

An economy is not just a matter of cold numbers and statistics. It involves the needs and the hopes of people. Let's look at the record of Democratic performance and see what it means to people.

The first thing a man needs is a job. Between 1953 and 1960, under the Republicans, expansion of the economy added roughly four and a half million jobs. But that expansion could not keep pace with the

growing number of Americans who needed jobs. Unemployment rose by two million during those Republican years.

In the eight years of Democratic leadership beginning in 1961, ten and a half million new jobs were created. This vigorous expansion more than outstripped the growth of the working population, so that we have now wiped out the job deficit of the Republican years. There are two million fewer people out of work today than in early 1961.

The first people to feel the impact of a recession are working men and women in such key industries as construction, steel, automobile manufacturing, transportation, and others. They are laid off in large numbers at the onset of a recession.

This country had four recessions in the past 22 years--and three of them came in the eight Republican years. A Democratic Administration has not only meant more jobs for the working people of this country; it has meant job security.

There is no prosperity for the worker unless his job pays him enough to feed, clothe and shelter his family and to educate his children.

In the first quarter of 1961, the spendable income--after taxes--of the average family of four was running at an annual rate of \$7,768. In the second quarter of 1968--after seven years of Democratic leadership--this same family of four had \$11,672 to spend after taxes--an increase of almost \$4,000.

Inflation--both Republicans and Democrats know--is indeed a serious problem, and it does eat into the value of the working man's dollar. But here is an important fact: The adjusted per capita spendable income in this country rose \$711 between the first quarter of 1961 and the second quarter of 1968. That is real gain--taking into account increased cost of living.

That means that the average family of four could live and eat

as well in 1968 as it had in 1961--and still have \$2,844 left over. That gain is enough to send a child to college for a year, or buy a new car, or make a substantial investment toward home ownership--without borrowing or dipping into the savings.

The net financial wealth of American households--assets and cash minus debts--increased more than \$500 billion between 1961 and 1968. With adjustments for rising costs, that is a real rise of almost 50 percent.

The average, middle class American family is not the only one with a stake in preventing a return to hidebound Republican economic policies. The increase in real personal income in the last eight years has lifted ten million persons out of the shadow of abject poverty to a plateau of at least modest economic independence.

And the minimum wage has been raised twice--over strong Republican opposition. The minimum wage and Fair Labor Standards laws have been extended to cover 13 million workers previously unprotected.

again over strong Republican opposition.

Democrats identified--for the first time--"hard core" unemployment, and then tackled the problem head on. They started on the immediate problem with programs of manpower retraining and job placement. In 1968 over a million people benefited from Democratic-sponsored training and employment programs.

And they tackled the long-range problem by declaring broad-scale, total War on Poverty. They moved to head off tomorrow's "hard core" unemployment by providing education, housing, food, jobs and civil rights for today's children of poverty and discrimination.

What is the Republican record? They tell us they are against unemployment and for equal opportunity. But they have consistently voted against extending the heart of the War on Poverty--the Economic Opportunity Act--by margins in the House of Representatives of 82 per cent in 1965, 88 per cent in 1966 and 84 per cent in 1967.

They tell us they are in favor of equal educational opportunities, but 73 per cent of them voted against aid to education in the House and in 1968, 64 per cent of them in the Senate voted against funds for Project Headstart.

They tell us they are for revitalizing urban America, to do away with slum conditions which breed despair and stifle initiative. Yet look at their record:

. . . 93 per cent of them in the House opposed the creation of a Department of Housing and Urban Development.

. . . 81 per cent of them in the House and 73 per cent in the Senate voted against the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.

. . . 88 per cent of them in the House voted against Model Cities, and 87 per cent of them in the House voted against a \$40 million rat control bill.

The Republicans tell us they are for continued agricultural prosperity and attacking the causes of rural poverty. Yet 85 per cent

of them in the House voted against the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, and 81 per cent of them in the House voted against the Appalachian Regional Development Act.

They tell us they favor adequate protection of the consumer from fraudulent and dangerous practices. Yet 68 per cent of them in the Senate voted to recommit and kill the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act, 52 per cent of them in the House voted against establishing a National Commission on Product Safety, and 83 per cent of them in the House voted to water down the Administration's Meat Inspection Act.

American business cannot afford a return to the three "R's" of Republican economic policy--retrenchment, recession, and retreat. It used to be that the Republicans, even if they were not the party of the little man or the average middle class man, could at least lay claim to being the party of the businessman. That time is no more.

American business has enjoyed a veritable Renaissance of free enterprise in this country in the last eight years. Corporate profits

have more than doubled, whole new industries have blossomed, and the horizons of our economic growth are truly unlimited.

The choice for the future of the entire American economy, then, is clear. It is a choice between the vigor and the far-sighted policies which have brought us to our present level of growth and prosperity, and the outdated and defeatist policies of the Republican Party which held us back in the 1950's.

It is more than that. It is a choice between two men.

Hubert Humphrey, the most creative legislator of our times, was the author--back in the 1950's--of many of the programs which have reduced unemployment and spurred economic growth and has been a principal architect of the successful Democratic economic policies of the past eight years.

Richard Nixon, who spent six years in the House and the Senate without developing or sponsoring a single major economic measure, served his apprenticeship in national economic affairs at the Cabinet

table with the Republican apostles of recession--and today offers little besides the ponderous policies which failed this country tragically in the 1930's and again in the 1950's.

Most important of all, this election poses a choice of direction for the future. There can be no prosperity for America tomorrow if millions of its people are left behind today---cut off by poverty, discrimination, hunger and illiteracy. We cannot afford to waste these human resources, and our economy will crumble with our social institutions if we choose the path of indifference and retreat.

Hubert Humphrey and the Democratic Party are pledged to mobilize the financial, technical and human resources of this country in the great work of rebuilding our cities and rehabilitating our underprivileged citizens. In that pledge lies the only hope of lasting prosperity and growth for America. That promise, like the others we have made, will be kept.

1968 is a year of decision for America and the world.

It is a time of challenge, but it is also a time of unparalleled opportunity.

Grave issues of peace, unrest, deprivation and hunger face us both at home and abroad. But, as never before in our history, we have the power to meet the challenges, to resolve those issues, if we make the right decisions.

First, let us decide now to turn away from the counsels of doubt, dissention and despair. These have no place in the American heart.

Who should we doubt? Why should we despair?

No people in the history of the world have achieved as much as we have.

We are all rightly concerned about unemployment, but remember, more Americans have jobs today than ever before in history.

We need to do more, but when you consider the tremendous strides we have already made, especially in the past 4 years, there is no reason to despair, no room for doubt.

We will succeed.

More older Americans are protected under Social Security and Medicare.

Millions more young Americans are getting a good education as a result of the Elementary and Secondary Act.

More Americans are getting better health care.

These are just a few of the tremendous achievements of the past four years.

UNDER THE COMMUNITY
HEALTH ASSIST. PARTNERSHIP
FOR HEALTH & MEDICARE

Are we content with these achievements?

No, of course not.

Americans are always seeking to negotiate a better contract and we will never be content until democracy's house is complete.

But, those who deny that record distort the truth.

They discredit the very ideals that you and I have fought for.

They cheat Americans out of pride and progress and shake their confidence in our nation's ability to face the future.

Dissention, doubt, and despair - that is the litany of those who sell America short.

Don't sell America short!

We have the skill, the strength and the resources to build a better world than our fathers ever dreamed of, if we decide to do it.

Once we have resolved to go forward in this way, we must make the most important decision of all, who will lead us.

What kind of a President do we need?

We need a wise, compassionate and experienced leader.

We need a man with the strength and maturity to guide this nation on a firm but flexible course of peace.

We need a man who understands and respects our great democratic institutions, and, at the same time, has the creative vision to build upon them for a better world.

We need a man who shares our faith in the American spirit and who brings joy and confidence to his task.

Above all, we need a man who can bring together all the diverse parts of our society and can unite us to meet the future with hope and determination.

When we ask ourselves who that man is, there can be only one answer -- only one decision for 1968 -- Hubert H. Humphrey, the next President of the United States.

Over the _____ years that I have been a Member of Congress, it has been my privilege and my pleasure to work with Vice President Humphrey, first, when he was Senator and later when he became the most active Vice President in our history. Let me state my firm belief that there is no more able and experienced administrator, no more creative and responsible legislator, no more decent and compassionate man in this nation today.

If you want to know what Hubert Humphrey's accomplishments have meant to this nation already

... Ask the senior citizens who have received modern medical care -- with dignity -- under Medicare. Hubert Humphrey first proposed this program in 1949. Today, more than 25 million hospital bills have been paid and more than 5 million patients have received doctor's services through it.

... Ask the nearly 4 million needy college students who have received Federal financial help. More than a decade ago, the Vice President proposed these programs which are now incorporated in the National Defense Education Act.

... Ask one of the 1/2 million unemployed youth who got jobs last year as a result of the program spearheaded by Vice President Humphrey as Chairman of the President's Council on Youth Opportunity.

... Ask the one million disadvantaged children who now have a chance to succeed because of the help they got through the Headstart program which the Vice President guided through Congress when he was Majority Whip.

... Ask the workers who have gotten job training and upgraded their skills through the Job Corps program, which was pioneered by the Vice President in 1957.

... Ask the farmers, the small businessmen, the laborers, all Americans who have benefitted from his progressive, creative legislation over the years.

The list of Vice President Humphrey's achievements is too long to give in detail here today.

In foreign affairs, he was the author of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty which now binds 100 nations in agreement not to test nuclear devices in the atmosphere.

He was the first to propose the establishment of the Peace Corps and the Food for Peace Program, which puts America's surplus food to work for peace by fighting hunger and deprivation around the world. He has carried out important missions overseas for his President, missions that have taken him to every continent -- to meet with national leaders from every major nation -- in search of peace.

One of America's most distinguished political analysts summed it up pretty well last month when he said:

"If Presidents were elected by the thousand best-informed men in Washington on the basis of who would make the best President, (Hubert Humphrey) would be number one ..."

Now, of course, Presidents aren't elected that way. They are elected by millions of Americans in all walks of life who vote for the man they think would be the best President and let me tell you Vice President Humphrey is number one there too. Because of his solid record of achievement extending back a quarter of a century, Vice President Humphrey has earned the trust and support of men and women from all walks of life, from every part of the country.

Young and old, black and white, businessmen and labor, farmer and city dweller, all who share his pride in America, his enthusiasm for the future, and his vision of a better world -- all these are reaching out to Hubert Humphrey.

In his speech on April 27 announcing his candidacy, Vice President Humphrey set forth a pledge - a pledge with which I and all Americans can march on to victory -

"I shall base everything I do on one conviction: That this country, working in a spirit of unity, can overcome any obstacle in finally realizing the fullness of freedom, the prize of peace, and the happiness of human opportunity -- here and in the world."

MEDICARE

QUESTION:

Medicare has become an integral part of the lives of many of our people. It has been my feeling that in general terms the program has been effectively operated. What is your evaluation of the program's operation to date?

ANSWER:

The first year and a half of Medicare has been very successful on a National basis. Over 19 million of our older citizens -- virtually all of them -- have the comfort of knowing that most of their bills will be paid by the hospital insurance part of Medicare if they have to go to the hospital and 17.9 million of them can also count on help from the voluntary medical insurance part of the program in paying any substantial doctors bills whether or not they go to the hospital. It is safe to say that Medicare has largely eliminated a major threat to the financial security of elderly Americans throughout the Nation. More than 7 1/2 million hospital bills have been paid and some 28 million bills under medical

insurance - mostly doctors' bills.

Letters I receive tell the story of the great success of this program. Letters from older people telling of benefits received and letters from their children telling of burdens relieved. I am sure that you too have received such letters.

Let's look at Medicare in terms of benefit amounts. In the first 18 months of operation the program paid out more than \$5.5 billion.

The success of the Medicare program has involved the cooperative efforts of the Federal and State Governments, the many hospitals and other institutions providing health care, physicians throughout the country, and private insurance organizations, particularly those that are helping to administer the program. Nearly 6,900 hospitals, accounting for about 80 percent of the country's hospital beds, are participating in Medicare. Nearly 4,400 extended care facilities and nearly 1,900 home health agencies are

participating.

Medicare has done more than help older people pay their medical bills. It has set the example of insuring a wide variety of health care services -- posthospital extended care, outpatient services, home health care, and physician services wherever provided as well as inpatient hospital services. This means a reduction in health care costs because of the provision of less expensive substitutes for institutional care, and it means better health care because it gives the physician the opportunity to prescribe the most appropriate level of care without regard to the patient's economic resources. Other insurance programs are now increasingly extending protection to posthospital extended care and home health care and other parts of a comprehensive health insurance program.

Because of Medicare, hospitals throughout the country are now open to minority group members on the basis of equality. High quality standards from a

health standpoint have been insisted on for institutional participants of the program. Although the Medicare program covers only 10 percent of the population, it has meant for the first time access to high quality care for many minority group members and has meant higher quality standards in many institutions for all people.

Because Medicare affects so many people, it has helped to focus attention on the sharply rising costs of medical care for all age groups. The Administration is very much concerned about this problem and is supporting a number of programs which we believe will improve the quality of medical care as well as reduce its cost. For example, under a provision of the 1967 amendments we will be experimenting with various methods of reimbursement to physicians, organizations, and institutions participating under Medicare, Medicaid and child health programs; the experiments will be designed to provide incentives for economy while maintaining or improving

the quality of care provided.

I know that our older Americans are living a little better because the 1965 and 1967 Social Security Amendments have increased their benefits by 23 percent in addition to Medicare benefits.

CRIME - PUBLIC SAFETY AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

QUESTION:

Turning to another serious domestic problem, it seems to me that the crime rate has been rising alarmingly fast. Quite frankly, in this day and age, it is my opinion that we should not only concern ourselves with getting a man safely to the moon, but also with getting him safely to the corner drugstore. What can be -- and what is being done to meet the growing crime problem?

ANSWER:

One of the things that could and should be done to meet the problem of crime in our society would be to enact the Administration's legislative program on this subject. As you know, on February 7th, the President sent a message to Congress "To meet the challenge of crime to our society . . ." He entitled that Message "To Insure the Public Safety." It contained 22 distinct and meaningful proposals. High on our list of priorities is the enactment of the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act that was sent to the Congress last year for action. That proposal is

basically an aid program to state and local governments to help them to improve all aspects of law enforcement, including programs for police, prosecution, courts, corrections, crime prevention and community relations.

We have to recognize that while the Federal Government may be able to assist the states and communities in developing law enforcement programs, the Federal Government cannot and should not substitute its authority for that of the states.

State and local governments have the responsibility for dealing with crime in the streets under our constitutional system. There is no authority for the establishment of a national police force. However, the Federal Government can, if the appropriate authority is granted, assist local law enforcement officials through education loans, assistance in developing better training programs for law enforcement officers, in the construction of new facilities, and in the acquisition of modern equipment.

On the same day that the President sent his Crime Message to the Congress, he signed an Executive Order giving the Attorney General authority to coordinate the criminal law enforcement activities of all Federal Departments and agencies. On that occasion he stated:

"Americans -- of all races -- want and deserve better law enforcement."

I think that is a most important point to make. Crime is not a racial problem. The people living in depressed urban centers suffer far more from crime than those of our citizens living in better communities. In every survey conducted in our Negro communities - better law enforcement was the top priority item. Ahead of jobs and ahead of better housing and even ahead of education.

Furthermore, crime, basically, is not integrated. Most crimes of violence are committed by and against people who know each other. Those who commit crimes of violence more commonly do so against

members of their own race. Relatively few major crimes are interracial. Those are findings of the National Crime Commission's Report of one year ago.

The recent Riot Commission Report states that: ". . . The majority of law abiding citizens who live in disadvantaged Negro areas face much higher probabilities of being victimized than residents of most higher-income areas, including almost all suburbs. For nonwhites, the probability of suffering from any . . . [major] crime except larceny is 78 percent higher than for whites."

Time will not permit a full discussion of all of the points in the President's Crime Message, but I think it would be useful to just list a few of them:

Auto Theft Prevention Act, a Gun Control Act to prevent the mail order sale of firearms, Federal Anti-Riot Act of 1968, the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act, and new legislation to fight drug abuse and big time gambling. These are only some of the steps being proposed. However,

even if all of the proposals were enacted, the problem will still have to be solved in each state and in each community.

QUESTION: What are we doing about the causes of crime?

ANSWER: While we seek to deal with the problems of crime, we are also moving to treat some of its causes. We are trying to work these problems out with private industry. In his Manpower Message in January, the President outlined a program for providing employment for some 500,000 hard-core unemployed over the next three years. It is planned that this program will be worked out with the cooperation of industry.

We are inaugurating programs to provide 6 million new housing units over the next 10 years to replace the sub-standard housing in which 20 million of our fellow citizens now live. We don't want to just treat the symptoms; we seek

to eradicate the disease.

We have done much to improve education. In the past four years, we have more than doubled the expenditure of Federal funds going to improve our schools than were spent in the previous 100 years. Such legislation, sponsored by this Administration has brought special educational and health services to nine million of our poorest children in all our fifty states. New library and instructional materials have been made available to 43 million children and 1.7 million teachers. That's another form of crime prevention.

We have also inaugurated housing and transportation programs, providing people with better places to live and a means of getting to jobs. You know this was one of the major problems of the Watts area in Los Angeles. We now have public transportation, as a result of Federal grants, which is taking people from Watts to jobs in Los Angeles.

We have by no means solved these problems, but we have made fruitful beginnings.

PEACE AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

QUESTION:

All Americans are concerned about the War in Vietnam and the seizure of an American Naval vessel - the Pueblo - by North Korea. But on a number of fronts the prospects for international cooperation and peace are much brighter. Would you care to comment on some of the more hopeful aspects of the world scene today and some of the initiatives in which you and other Administration officials are involved that hold out the hope of preventing conflict and tragedy in the future.

ANSWER:

During last year we were able to achieve agreement in the Kennedy Round negotiations for a great reduction in tariff barriers.

- At Punta del Este, Uruguay, President Johnson met with the presidents of the countries of Latin America and basic agreement was achieved on economic integration for Latin America.

- In Asia, the Asian Development Bank has begun its operations with our assistance constituting only about 20

percent of its capital. Over 60 percent of its funds come from the countries of Asia and the remainder from Western European countries.

- By and large we enjoy the warmth and friendship of the people and the leaders of the African countries.

- During the Arab-Israeli War last June, the "hot-line" between Washington and Moscow was used for the first time. A cease-fire was achieved and there was no "great" power confrontation.

- In 1967, we achieved agreement with the Soviet Union on a consular treaty, the first commercial air agreement, and a treaty banning weapons in outer space.

- The President's representative, Cyrus Vance, was able to assist Greece and Turkey in relieving the tensions that had arisen between them.

While very serious problems persist, I am certain all would agree that the actions and initiatives I have mentioned are the building blocks of peace.

QUESTION: Above all else, our greatest concern this year is the difficult conflict in Vietnam. What is your impression of the feelings of other Southeast Asian countries? Do they agree with us on the danger?

ANSWER: There is no doubt as to the support we receive from the countries of Asia. Prime Minister Sato of Japan, President Marcos of the Philippines, Prime Minister Lee of Singapore, and President Park have all expressed their nations' support for our effort. That is by no means the end of the list. The Australians, the Thais, and the New Zealanders have also expressed their support.

This commitment to our joint efforts in South Vietnam goes beyond mere words. There are now approximately 60,000 Australian, Korean, New Zealand, Philippine and Thai troops on the ground in South Vietnam. Additional pledges of support from Australia, New Zealand and Thailand will raise that to over 70,000

troops. That is to be compared with the maximum figure of 48,000 non-U.S. troops assisting the South Koreans at the height of the Korean War.

The countries I have mentioned, as well as other countries of Southeast Asia, are keenly aware of the dangers confronting them. Many of them were fighting Communist subversion and aggression long before we entered on the scene. Burma, Malaysia and Indonesia have fought long and bitter battles against Communist subversion. Laos and Thailand are even now being subjected to the pressures of external aggression. These countries not only agree with us as to the dangers confronting them, but it is their land that is the battleground where the fight against aggression is being waged.

We are being tested in Asia. We have succeeded to great and grave responsibilities. Our ability to assume these responsibilities is not in question. It is our will to see them through that is being tried.

QUESTION:

Do you see any progress toward greater strength and cooperation among the Southeast Asian countries? Will these countries be able in the future to stand on their own feet and resist subversion and violence?

ANSWER:

In addition to their cooperative efforts in combating external aggression, the countries of Asia have under their own initiative formed the Asian Development Bank. This is a multi-national financial institution. It has been founded with a capital structure of one billion dollars. More than 60 percent of that amount was contributed by the countries of Asia. We have made a 20 percent contribution and the remainder has been pledged by countries throughout the world. None of the Communist countries are participating in the Asian Development Bank. This is a massive self-help effort on the part of the Asian countries, begun by Asian initiative and largely financed with Asian capital to provide a cooperative program of regional development.

Basic programs under consideration are in the fields of regional communications, transportation, and power development.

I think that the joint effort in Vietnam, coupled with the effort by the Asian countries in the Asian Development Bank, are a clear indication of their positive actions to achieve economic development and their willingness to assume the responsibility to resist aggression.

ECONOMIC POLICY

QUESTION:

We are living through the longest period of steady economic growth in our country's history. But even so, we still face some serious fiscal policy questions. The costs of the war added to the expenses of government for a rapidly growing population here at home have caused budget deficits and other inflationary pressures.

We can all agree on the necessity for restraint in spending and in wage and price pressures, but a tax increase is much more controversial. Would you comment on some of the factors behind the President's tax increase proposal to the Congress?

ANSWER:

As you have indicated, this is the beginning of our eighth year of continuous economic growth and prosperity. From the time that President Kennedy took office in 1961 through the current administration of President Johnson, we have increased the number of jobs in this country by almost 9.5 million. There are now over 75 million wage earners in the country. Back in 1961 unemployment was running at a rate of 6.8 per cent, almost 7 per cent. Currently, our unemployment rate of 3.5 per cent is at the lowest level in fifteen years. Our wealth, or really our ability

ECONOMIC POLICY (cont.)

to produce wealth, our gross national product (GNP), has risen an astronomical \$300 billion in this seven year period, approaching an annual product of \$820 billion.

Perhaps the enormity of this wealth can be understood only by comparison. The value of the goods and services we produce every year exceeds that produced by all the developed countries of the world combined. In fact, the increase in our gross national product this year over what it was last year, that increase alone (about \$50 billion), exceeds the total gross national product of most of the countries of the world. Specifically, that \$50 billion increase is greater than the gross national product of all the countries of the free world except for the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Italy, Japan and Canada.

With this great wealth have come grave and extensive responsibilities, both at home and abroad. The pledges that this administration has made to the American people are being kept. Federal expenditures to education are double what they were over the previous 100 years. Social Security and Medicare benefits have risen 35 per cent over the past four years. Programs of opportunity and hope have lifted 12 million people out of the waste and degradation of poverty. But that job is not done - despite our great efforts

ECONOMIC POLICY (cont.)

over the past four years we are just beginning to turn the corner on what generations of neglect have done to our great cities. To delay action is to shift these great responsibilities to our children and our grandchildren. The bill is really past due and there is no way that further delay on those obligations can be justified.

In the same manner that we are trying to squarely face our obligations at home we are keeping the pledges made to the people of Vietnam and Asia to stand with them in opposing aggression. In so doing, we are keeping our pledge to the American people to maintain the peace, for the peace cannot be kept by ignoring aggression.

We have the intelligence, we have the programs, we have the wealth to meet our commitments. However, we must also have the will to meet them. The President's proposal for a modest tax increase is an expression of our will to meet our obligations responsibly. The proposed tax increase will reduce our budget deficit by approximately \$12 billion.

In sum then, the tax increase will permit us to meet our obligations at home and abroad while safeguarding the health of our economy from the dangers of inflation.

ECONOMIC POLICY (cont.)

QUESTION: I have come to agree, reluctantly, that we must have a tax increase. But there is strong opposition to any tax increase at all. What do you feel would be the result if Congress decided against a tax bill this year?

ANSWER: The greatest danger to our unprecedented prosperity is inflation. So far this has not been a serious problem. While there have been increases in prices, these increases have been at rates below price rises in all other major industrial countries, and have been off set by marked increases in productivity.

However, in the past two years those previous relatively minor price increases have risen to rate increases of between 3 and 4 per cent. Thus, the erosion of our prosperity through inflation has become a real danger.

To meet this problem the administration is seeking a modest temporary tax increase. The proposed increase will automatically expire on June 30, 1969. For individual wage earners the proposed tax would amount on the average to less than one cent for each dollar of income. For the corporate tax payer, the tax increase would amount to about a full cent for each dollar of income. The proposed tax rate for people and businesses restores less than half the

tax cut that was granted in 1964 and 1965. In other words, even after the tax increase is granted our tax rates will still be lower than they were in 1963.

The proposed tax is designed to strengthen our economy and to insure our continued prosperity. If we are successful in curbing inflation, the price of U.S. goods will be more attractive to foreign buyers. Greater purchases of U.S. goods will improve our international trading position - this in turn strengthens the dollar as an international currency. This is particularly important as the dollar, today, is the linchpin of the free world's international monetary system. Billions upon billions of dollars are held by foreign traders today because they have faith in the value and stability of the dollar. We must assure them that such faith is justified by fighting inflation through the proposed tax surcharge.

If we do not act to increase taxes as proposed we may be faced with additional monetary restraint - that's just a fancy way of saying "tight money". "Tight money" puts the squeeze on those who have to operate on credit - farmers, small businessmen, home builders and State and

local governments. If we go that route we will be faced with further increases in interest rates and a possible disruption of our financial markets. Instead of imposing a tax which is spread equally throughout the economy, "tight money" in effect imposes a tax

ECONOMIC POLICY (cont.)

inequitably and less efficiently than the program proposed by the President.

Finally, I think we must simply recognize that we cannot keep faith in meeting our obligations and at the same time accept any major cuts in proposed programs. Neither our defense needs nor our social priorities can be compromised.

We have the means to fulfill our obligations. We can do so responsibly by accepting a modest increase in taxes.

QUESTION: I sometimes feel that our intense concentration on economic problems and the solemn tones used in discussing them tend to create the false impression that we are on the brink of disaster.

Don't you agree that conditions are a lot less painful than those we faced a few years ago when we were searching for ways to stimulate growth and cut the tragic unemployment that plagued so many thousands of communities?

ANSWER: I know that you are correct. We have the means and the talent in this country to end the waste and misery of poverty whenever we decide that's what we want to do. We have the obligation to see that opportunity for good jobs and comfortable housing is not denied any of our people.

ECONOMIC POLICY (cont.)

As a nation that has created 9.5 million jobs and increased our gross national product by \$300 billion in the past seven years, I know that we are capable of finding good, workable and fair solutions for our problems. We have taken some giant steps in that direction over the past four years. The problems we seek to resolve are scarcely new. They are compounded by the neglect of many generations. It is going to take a lot of planning, hard work, money and a little time before we're finished. We have made a good start with new ideas and bold programs.

YOUNG PEOPLE

QUESTION:

I'd like to ask you a general question, if I may. Many people are saying today that the American spirit of self-help is eroding . . . that our people today expect others to do their work for them, as if the world owes them a living . . . that our youth lacks self-discipline and ambition. Do you agree with that kind of evaluation?

ANSWER:

Absolutely not. More people are gainfully employed today than ever before in the history of this country. The prosperity we are now enjoying - and have enjoyed without a break for the last 84 months - is based upon the spirit and hard work of those 75 million wage earners.

As far as our young people are concerned, I wish we could hear a little bit more about their efforts in the Peace Corps, in the Teacher Corp, in Vista and Head Start and in community action programs. Young people are enrolling in the Job Corps seeking new opportunity.

I wish we could hear more about these thousands and thousands of young people working to make a better world - they typify the American spirit. I have faith in them, as I know you do.

ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM

QUESTION:

I'd like to begin by asking a question about one of the problems that has plagued the nation since the Constitutional Convention of 1789 -- the manner in which we elect the President and Vice President. There are proposals to do away with the Electoral College system and substitute direct, popular election of our two highest officers, and there are proposals for the reform of the system. What are your views on this?

ANSWER:

Before we get to that, I should first like to acknowledge the important accomplishment in obtaining the adoption of the 25th Amendment to our Constitution providing for Presidential succession in the event of the resignation, death, or disability of the President. The significance of that accomplishment is characterized as "an effort to guarantee continuity within the Executive Branch of Government. It is designed to provide that we shall always have a President physically and mentally alert. Second, and of equal

importance, it is to assure that whoever the man be, there will be no question of legality of his authority to carry out the powers and duties of the office." It was certainly a most worthy achievement.

Now coming back to your question. As you know, the Administration has proposed Electoral College Reform. The Administration's proposal is more modest than the complete abolition of the Electoral College system substituting the direct popular election of the President and the Vice President.

We have proposed both in 1965 and 1966 a reform of the Electoral College system along the following lines.

In the first instance our proposal would eliminate the possibility that an "independent" elector could cast his vote in a way other than what the people have intended.

Second, if a Presidential election is thrown into the House of Representatives, the present system empowers the House to elect a President from the three top

candidates. However, each state casts but one vote. In this manner, the least populous states have the same vote as the most populous. The Administration proposal would eliminate this possibility.

In the third place, under the existing system, while the House elects the President in these circumstances, the Senate elects the Vice President. This of course raises the unhappy possibility of a President and Vice President from different parties. We would remedy that.

Fourth, since the District of Columbia has no representation in the Congress under these circumstances people of the District would be deprived of their right, under the 23rd Amendment, to participate in the election of the President and the Vice President. The Administration's proposal would eliminate this inequity.

Finally, existing law does not provide for what should be done in the event of the death of the President-elect or the Vice President-elect between the election and the counting of the electoral votes in

JOB CORPS

QUESTION:

There are some Federal programs for which it has been difficult to obtain public acceptance and interest. Now that this acceptance and interest has been forthcoming, it has been necessary to "cut back" on the funding for many of these programs. A prime example of this is the Job Corps Program. Now that it has been started we are told that there are not enough funds to operate it. This type of administrative activity "fuels the fire" of those who believe that this and other programs are poorly planned. Would you comment?

ANSWER:

I think we have to put that shoe on the foot it fits. The facts are that the President's request for funds for the Poverty Program were severely cut by the Congress for the current fiscal year (fiscal 1968). If you will bear with me, I'd like to review for you just what has happened.

The President had requested \$2.060 billion for the Office of Economic Opportunity for the current fiscal year. Congress cut that request by \$285 million and earmarked for transfer to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an additional \$10 million for vocational education.

Furthermore, the Administration has responded to Congressional desires for special impact programs for the hard-core unemployed and an Emergency Food and Medical Program by allocating \$30 million to these new projects. These actions necessitated a cut of \$327 million from the President's original request for the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The costs of Federal programs are frequently met both from the current year's New Obligational Authority and from obligations made in previous years. Thus, cost is often a better financial measure of the magnitude of program operations than New Obligational Authority considered alone.

In 1967, the Job Corps operated a program costing \$340 million which was financed by a substantial portion of prior years funds along with the \$209.2 million in FY 1967 New Obligational Authority.

In 1968, Job Corps projected essentially the same program for a cost of \$317.5 million, a reduction in cost of \$22.5 million, due principally to the absence of major facilities costs and other start-up costs for new training centers. However, because of a decrease in the amounts of funds available from prior year obligations, the projected requirements for New Obligational Authority in FY 1968 were increased \$85.8 million to \$295 million.

For seven months, the Job Corps has been operating at the obligational rate of \$295 million. This level has now been reduced to \$285 million -- as a result of the Administration's response to Congressional desires for special impact programs for the hard-core

unemployed -- and the recovery of \$10 million, in what amounts to just the last quarter of the fiscal year, can be achieved only by the immediate curtailment of operations on a much larger scale than would be necessary at a point earlier in the fiscal year.

In a training program like the Job Corps, the major impact of a reduction of dollars results in a corresponding reduction of many years of training, in spite of the fact that economies have been made first at all other possible levels. A decision to reduce training by one many year taken on the first day of the fiscal year can be implemented by closing out one space. However, when the decision comes late in the fiscal year, several training spaces may have to be closed out in order to produce the resources required to finance the equivalent of one many year of training. Hence, the relative severity of the program cut resulting from a reduction of only ten million dollars in New Obligational Authority available to

the Job Corps when the reduction is made in the latter part of the fiscal year.

To determine which Centers would be closed, the Job Corps evaluated all 98 male centers and ranked each on the basis of the following seven criteria:

1. Operating costs
2. Length of stay of enrolees
3. 30-day dropout rate
4. Reading gains
5. Math gains
6. Placement capability
7. Community Relations

Although one of the centers to be closed is the Swiftbird Conservation Center near Eagle Butte, South Dakota, the decision to close this center did not rest upon an evaluation of center effectiveness. Unlike the fifteen other centers to be closed, this center never received an input of Corpsmen, and to activate a new center -- and thus to increase the number of manyears or man-spaces -- in the face of fifteen centers closures, would be neither logical, nor economical. Thus, considerations named above required the deletion from our program of projects like the Swiftbird Center.

For fiscal 1969, the Job Corps anticipates an appropriation from the Congress equal to that required to operate the program at the present level, without the activation of new centers (other than those model community vocational education schools and skill centers required by Title I, Section 113(c) of the 1967 Economic Opportunity Amendments), and without the reactivation of those centers recently closed.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND AGRICULTURE

QUESTION:

The migration of people from farms and small towns to the cities, how massive is it, and is the decline in farm jobs the major factor in this movement?

ANSWER:

During the 1950's some 600,000 people a year moved from the farms and non-metropolitan towns and cities into our urban areas. During the first half of this decade this migration rate dropped dramatically with non-metropolitan areas losing an average of less than 120,000 people a year. Improvements in agricultural efficiency, which have contributed greatly to economic growth and national prosperity, also released phenomenal numbers of farm laborers from agricultural production. Over five and a half million farmers and farm workers (5.7 million) left the land between 1940 and 1966. Many of course, found their way to our larger cities.

QUESTION:

This liquidation of farms which transfers millions of people from the countryside to overcrowded, congested cities, do we have to accept this as inevitable?

ANSWER:

This diminishing of farm jobs is a continuing process - a fact of life in every industrialized nation in the world.

New technological breakthroughs appear just around the corner in a number of agricultural fields, including tobacco. A whole new generation of machines is already beginning to appear in the fruit and vegetable field.

It is estimated the need for farm labor will drop another 45 percent over the next 15 years. Furthermore, so many farm workers already have so little to do, earn so little income, that one out of three are virtually unemployed.

Many farm workers who move to the big cities have no other skills, no preparation for city life. In effect, their migration is frequently only a transfer of their problems from a rural setting to a more concentrated, more visible urban setting. They seek what men have always sought - opportunity for the pursuit of happiness.

QUESTION: But is this inevitable? Can or is something being done about it -- something to stop this forced exodus to the cities? Or do we want to interrupt this trend?

ANSWER: To answer you in order: No, this exodus is not inevitable, and something is being done to reverse the tide, to explore the issues.

Two months ago the Vice President and the Secretaries of six Federal departments met to explore this growing problem of people/space imbalance -- the interrelated twin ailments of urban impaction and rural decline.

The objective was to start a national dialogue that would help decide this urgent question of living space for man. Is it good for the people and the nation for 70 percent of us to live in cities that cover less than 2 percent of our land? If not, why not?

Should we formulate a national policy to divert new economic growth, and therefore people, into non-impacted

towns and cities, or should we intensify our efforts to improve our cities? The fact is that we must deal with both.

This meeting was a first infant step toward charting a national course for our people and their land -- a course that could make it possible for 300 million Americans to live tomorrow in better conditions than 200 million live today.

But we are not waiting for an end to this dialogue before we act. We are at work trying to strengthen and revitalize the economy, the countryside, with its towns and small cities, to help their people build new homes, create new jobs, obtain new public services, and expand their cultural opportunities.

QUESTION: Do you believe our countryside and small towns can be saved - and how?

ANSWER: Certainly. Rural areas possess the potential for significant development in the years ahead. As we have already

indicated, just in the next thirty years our population will grow by about 100 million; we will be a nation of 300 million. We are going to have to do some pretty intensive planning just to meet the needs of all those new folks. For example, today our dependable supply of fresh water is about 315 billion gallons a day - at the turn of the century it is estimated we will need close to 1,000 billion gallons a day, three times the present supply. Now we are doing something about that. Since January 1964, the Federal Government has made grants of \$271 million, under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to help communities to build sewage treatment plants. These projects will improve some 16,000 miles of streams affecting 17.5 million people.

Under the Water Quality Act of 1965, water quality standards are being set for interstate and coastal water ways. We also have the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966, which provides new incentives for states, in partnership with industry

and the Federal Government to develop comprehensive plans for pollution control.

At least in the area of water pollution, I think we have made a good start. The programs currently being operated affect 60 percent of our land area and over 85 percent of our population.

Another aspect of our current activity which I think is not always fully understood is the extent to which programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development actually affect rural communities. Perhaps we ought to change the name of that department to Housing and Community Development, because HUD programs are available and function in both small as well as large communities. Furthermore, that department recognizes the critical importance of rural community development.

Again I think some specific examples are illustrative of the point. About 90 percent of the advances made for the Public Works Planning Program are made to communities under 50,000, and more than

50 percent are made to communities under 5,500. Under the Public Facilities Loan Program for the construction of municipal buildings, bridges, water and sewer projects, all loans are restricted to communities under 50,000 and 96 percent of all projects assisted under this program have been to communities under 10,000. Of the 850 communities participating in urban renewal programs, more than half have been to communities under 25,000. The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 provided the first insured housing plan program for rural areas. Under the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (Model Cities) authorization is provided for land development mortgage insurance for developers of entire new towns and new communities.

Certainly we haven't solved all of our problems, but I know you agree that we are taking some impressive steps to meet these needs. Our rural communities are now going to grow and share in our great prosperity.

QUESTION: What are we going to do to improve rural life?

ANSWER: We can greatly improve the quality of rural life; we can expand the opportunity in rural life so that people driven by desperation will not merely transfer their problems from a rural setting to an urban one.

 In his message on agriculture of February 27th of this year, the President stated that:

 "Too many rural communities have been by-passed in the climb to abundance, the poverty of its people standing in stark contrast to the wealth of the land."

 To bring new prosperity to rural America the President has proposed a 7-point program:

 1. Permanent extension of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, the backbone of our support programs for the farmer.

 2. Continuation of the Food for Freedom Program through 1971.

 3. Creation of a National Food Bank-- a security reserve of wheat, feed grains and soybeans to protect the consumer against food scarcity and the farmer against falling prices.

 4. New bargaining authority for the farmer, to give him a stronger voice in

setting terms and conditions for the sale of farm products.

5. Aid and hope for the small farmer.

6. Continued revitalization of America's rural heartland by improving men's lives through decent housing, better jobs, and more rapid community development.

These programs proposed by the Administration are directed to creating jobs and new opportunity in our rural communities. The President has directed the Secretaries of Commerce and Agriculture to develop expanded credit programs for firms seeking to locate new plants in rural areas. Under Presidential directive, top priority government loans are to be given for the construction of industrial buildings in rural areas. Additional recommendations are made for manpower training, rural community planning, increased Federal programs for rural community water and sewage development and the creation of additional community centers where rural residents can have access to programs designed to help him and his family.

The fact of the matter is that we are

in process of formulating a national policy that will both enrich the lives of rural residents and urban dwellers. We have no choice. We must do both.

We are doing just that. Eight of the 63 Federal Model City grants went to cities of under 50 thousand population. Programs of planned coordinated development will be inaugurated in each of these communities. What we learn in those communities will help us in improving the quality of life in other towns and cities.

We have defined our problems in this area. We already have significant programs operating. I am confident that we are moving in the right direction for improved communities of tomorrow.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM

QUESTION: What do you see as the major contributions, problems, and projects of the Food for Freedom program?

ANSWER: As you know, the Food for Peace Program was inaugurated in 1961 based upon the following premises:

- The sharing of our great food resources was morally right. We could not expect stable economic and political development where hunger persisted. Of the world's children under six years of age, 70 percent suffered from malnutrition.

- We could not expect low-income economies to be good commercial markets.

The Food for Peace Program not only built stability, but created new markets for American abundance. For example, Japan, one of the early recipients of PL 480, is now the biggest cash customer of U.S. farm products.

Early in 1966, President Johnson sent to Congress a wide-gauged message proposing a Food for Freedom program designed to encourage the upgrading of agriculture in

the developing countries. As a result of those proposals, the program is on sounder footing today.

The new objectives of the Food for Freedom program are two-fold. It shifts the emphasis of the previous program from surplus disposal to one of planned production for export. It further requires efforts on the part of foreign countries to increase their own agricultural production as a condition for receiving PL 480 support and encourages them to undertake population control programs.

I might note in passing that over the past four years many hundreds of millions of dollars worth of agricultural products have been exported to developing countries from American farms. So that in addition to helping our friends throughout the world under this program, we are also helping the farmers of America.

An increasingly apparent aspect of our food aid program - apart from the war on hunger under which we have helped hundreds of millions of people - is the

fact that it is one of our most important long-range market development tools.

Food aid helps needy countries "buy the time" they need to develop economically. Millions of people learn better food habits. Countries that achieve economic development almost automatically become commercial, dollar-paying customers for our farm products. We have seen this happen with many countries - Spain, Greece, Israel, Taiwan and South Korea.

A short time ago, the largest single export sale of U.S. rice was agreed to between the Rice Growers Association of California and South Korea, a former recipient of Food for Peace shipments.

Last year we signed agreements with the Government of India providing for the shipment of 8 million tons of grain. This will bring to 50 million tons - mainly wheat - the amount of grain we have sent to India since 1951. India is moving ahead with a number of actions to improve her own food production substantially. We can be more optimistic about India's food

situation today than we were a year ago.

1967 was a year of progress. The developing nations are placing a greater emphasis on agriculture. Food aid, no longer free, is exchanged for commitments by the developing nations to improve agriculture. During 1967, the U.S. signed food aid agreements with 22 developing countries.

GUS TYLER

Darry

NY CIT FOR HHH
TAPE BEGINS:

TO JOHN STEWARD
FROM GUS TYLER
RE: VP SPEECH
TWX 710 822 9210

RECENTLY, I VISITED INDEPENDANCE MISSOURI, TOGETHER WITH MY
RUNNING MATE, SENATOR MUSKIE. TO SPEND A FEW MINUTES WITH THAT
GRAND OLD MAN OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY, HARRYXXXXX PRESIDENT
HARU S. TRUMAN.

AT ONE MOMENT, AS I LOOKED AT THE LINCOLNWSQUE FIGURE OF SENATOR
MUSKIE AND THEXXREKXS JACKSONIAN RUGGEDNESS OF PRESENCE OF HONEST
ABE AND OLD HICKORY.

BOTH OF THESE- LINCOLN AND JACKSON, THE FOUNDING FATHERS OF OUR
TWO GREAT PARTIES- WERE MEN OF THE PEOPLE, WHO GOVERNED IN TROUBLED
TIMES. THEY WERE ABLE TO BRING CREATION OUT OF CHAOS BECAUSE THEY
HAD A FUNDAMENTAL FAITH IN THE GOODNESS AND THE GREATNESS OF THE AMERIC-
AN PEOPLE.

THEY SAW IN THE CHALLENGE OF OXXPROBLEMS THE CHANCE FOR PROGRESS.
IN THESE TROUBLED TIMES I ASK EACH OF YOU TO JOIN WITH ME IN A
REAFFIRMATION OF THAT FAITH: NOT TO CURSE THE DARKNESS BUT TO LIGHT
A CANDLE. I APPEA; TO THE SILENT MAJORITY OF AMERICA TO VOICE
ITS BELIEF IN THE DECENCY OF OUR DEMOCRACY, TO GO TO THE POLLS THIS
NOVEMBER IN THE SPIRIT OF FAITH NOT FEAR, IN THE SPIRIT OF HOPE NOT
HATE, IN THE SPIRIT OF JACKSON, LINCOLN AND ROODXXX ROOSEVELT, IN
THE SPIRIT OF THE PIONEERS WHO CROSSED OCEANS, MOUNTAINS AND DESERTS
TO OVERCOME ALL OBSTACLES TO BUILD A LAND WITH LIBERTY AND JUSTICE
FOR ALL.

IT WAS IN THAT SPIRIT TOO, THAT I VISITED PRESIDENT TRUMAN WHO
OVERCAME ALL ODDS TO WIN AN ELECTION, WHO OPENED THE HAND OF AMERICA
TO REBUILD THE ECONOMY OF A BROKEN EUROPE, WHO OPENED THE HEART OF
AMERICA TO BIND THE WOUNDS OF A WAR-TORN WORLD.

I TURNED TO HIM FOR INSPIRATION AND FOR ADVICE. HE GAVE BOTH
"TELL 'EM THE TRUTH", HE SAID, "EVEN IF IT HURTS". I INTEND TO DO
X JUST THAT- TO TELL IT LIKE IT IS- YES. EVEN IF IT HURTS. THE
HARSH TRUTH IS THAT WE LIVE IN A TIME OF POLITICAL CRISIS THAT IS
WORLD WIDE. THE OLD ORDER CHANGES TO MAKE WAY FOR THE NEW. THE
WORLD IS CONFRONTED WITH A NUMEROUS NEW GENERATION NEW GNATIONS
NEW TECHNIQUES, NEW MEDIA, NEW IDEAS, AND EVEN NEW IDEALS. THE
WORLD IS PASSING THROUGHTXXXXX THROUGH THE GROWING PAINS OF A
NEW YOUTH, GROPING TO FIND ITSELF, STRUGGLING TO ESTABLISH ITS
IDENTITY. OUT OF THIS GROPING AND GRASPING AND GROWING ON THE PART
OF THE NEW GENERATIONS AND NEW PEOPLES HAS ARISEN CONFLICT -
BETWEEN NATIONS AND WITHIN NATIONS, WHEREEVER THEY MAY BE.

IN FACING THIS FACT OF WISXXX WIDESPREAD CONFLICT WE MUST STAKE
OUR FIRST PRIORITY: IT IS PEACE.

2
THE ANSWER TO CONFLICT IS NOT TO ESCALATE THE WAR EITHER HERE OR ABROAD, WHETHER IN OUR CITY STREETS NOR IN VIETNAM. WE MUST FIND THE PATHS TO PEACE. IN A SOCIETY AS COMPLEX AS OURS, INTERNAL STRIFE CAN PARALYZE AND DESTROY US, WHITE OR BLACK, RICH OR POORXXX POOR. IN A ~~WORLD~~ WORLD ARMED WITH NUCLEAR POWER, INTERNATIONAL STRIFE CAN EXTERMINATE MANKIND!

WE MUST BEGIN OUR SEARCH FOR PEACE WITH A DECLARATION OF INTERDEPENDENCE: WE ARE DEPENDANT UPON ONE ANOTHER AS PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN THIS NATION; WE ARE DEPENDANT ON EACH OTHER AS A NATION THAT LIVES IN THIS WORLD.

THERE CAN BE NO LASTING PEACE FOR ANY OF US UNLESS THERE IS LASTING PEACE FOR ALL OF US.

MY PLATFORM FOR 1968 CAN BE PUT IN ONE WORD. THAT WORD IS **PEACE**

I DO NOT MEAN PEACE IN VIETNAM ALONE, ALTHOUGH THAT MUST BE AND SHALL BE MY FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS. I DO NOT SIMPLY MEAN THE BUILDING OF BRIDGES OF UNDERSTANDING TO ALL THE NATION OF THE EARTH. I MEAN PEACE IN OUR OWN NATION, AS WELL. I MEAN CIVIL PEACE IN THE COMMUNITIES OF AMERICA. I MEAN PEACE ON EARTH BUILT ON GOOD WILL AMONG MEN,

I ALSO SAY TO YOU THAT WHERE THERE IS NO GOOD WILL THERE CAN BE NO PEACE. BUILD JAILS AND RAISE ARMIES, SWING CLUBS AND DROP BOMBS- BUT IF THERE IS NO GOOD WILL, THERE CAN BE NO PEACE.

CONFRONTED WITH CONFLICT, ON A WORLD-WIDE SCALE, DIFFERENT PEOPLE ~~WE~~ WILL REACT IN DIFFERENT WAYS.

THE TYPICAL DICTATORIAL WAY IS TO REACT WITH REPRESSION. THE TYPICALLY DEMOCRATIC WAY IS TO ACT WITH REFORM.

ALL ARE AGREEED, OF COURSE, THAT THERE MUST BE LAW AND ORDER . . NO SOCIETY IN THE WORLD CAN TOLERATE THE OUT LAW AND DIS-ORDER. THE ISSUE IS "WHAT" AND "HOW" : WHAT KIND OF LAW AND HOW KEEP THE ORDER.

WE BELIEVE IN OUR DEMOCRACY IN THE KIND OF LAW THAT WILL ALLOW EVERY HUMAN BEING THE FULLEST OPPORTUNITY TO LIVE AND GROW AND DEVELOP HIS GOD-GIVEN RIGHTS AND TALENTS. LAWS THAT DENY SUCH OPPORTUNITY ARE LAWS THAT PROMOTE DISORDER. WE ALSO BELIEVE, IN OUR DEMOCRACY, THAT WE MUST SEPARATE THE TRULY GUILTY FROM THE TRULY INNOCENT AND NOT APPLY THE PRIMITIVE RULE OF GUILT BY COLOR, OR BY RELIGION, OR BY AGE, OR BY ANYOTHER FORM OF ASSOCIATION. WE BELIEVE IN INDIVIDUAL- NOT COLLECTIVE GUILT. THE INDISCRIMINATE USE OF PUNATIVE POWER CAN ONLY PROMOTE DISORDER.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES ACCURATELY DEFINED THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES IN COUNTERING VIOLENCE WHEN HE SAID RECENTLY:

"AN EXPRESS MANDATE TO THE ENTIRE POLICE COMPLEMENT TO USE THE MINIMUM FORCE NECESSARY TO EXECUTE LAWFUL ORDER , TO REFRAIN FROM USE OF EXCESSIVE FORCE, MUST BE UNDERSTOOD BY EVERY OFFICER.

"IT IS THE DUTY OF LEADERSHIP AND LAW ENFORCEMENT TO CONTROL VIOLENCE NOT TO CAUSE IT. TO SEEK WAYS OF RELIEVING TENSION, NOT TO LOOK FOR A FIGHT"

IN OUR DEMOCRACY TOO, THE PRIMARY JURISDICTION FOR MAINTAINING ORDER RESTS WITH LOCAL - NOT WITH FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. IT IS IRONIC, TO SAY THE LEAST, TO HEAR PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES WHO HAVE, FOR YEARS, BEEN MAKING A FETISH OUT OF STATE'S RIGHTS, PROCLAIM THAT THEY WOULD USE THE PRESIDENTIAL POWER TO POLICE THE STREETS OF OUR TOWNS. ONE OF THESE, MOST IRONICALLY, IS A MAN WHO WAS GOVERNOR OF A STATE WITH THE HIGHEST MURDER RATE OF ANY STATE IN THE UNION. HE COULD NOT MAINTAIN ORDER IN HIS OWN STATE WHERE HE HAD THE POWER BUT NOW PROMISES TO MAINTAIN ORDER IN EVERY COXXX CITY AND STATE WHERE HE WILL NOT HAVE THE POWER.

YES, THERE IS SOMETHING THAT THE FEDERAL GOVT CAN DO ABOUT LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT. IT CAN PROVIDE FUNDS AND IDEAS FOR MODERNIZING POLICE METHODS, FOR UPGRADING PERSONNEL, FOR GIVING THE POLICE A POSITIVE ROLE IN THE COMMUNITY. AT PRESENT, WE CALL ON OUR POLICE TO PERFORM DANGEROUS AND DELICATE WORK AND WE ASK THEM TO DO IT WITH OUTWORN METHODS ON OUTWORN SCALES OF PAY. A POLICEMAN'S LOT IS, INDEED, NOT A HAPPY ONE BUT TO EQUIP THE POLICE TO DEAL WITH ITS PROBLEMS WE, IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, MUST BE PREPARED TO PAY THE BILL. AND ONCE MORE IT IS MOST IRONIC TO HEAR THE CALL FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT COME FROM THE SPOKESMAN OF A PARTY THAT HAS SO CONSISTENTLY RESISTED THE EFFORTS OF THIS ADMINISTRATION TO GET NECESSARY FUNDS FOR NEEDED SOCIAL SERVICES, INCLUDING LAW ENFORCEMENT.

I SAY THAT THE MISUSE OF THE LAW AND ORDER CATCH-WORD IN THIS CAMPAIGN IS A PERIL TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE: IT IS AN APPEAL TO FEAR UNDERSTANDABLE FEAR TO SUBSTITUTE THE REPRESSION FOR REFORM.

I SAY: BEWARE OF THOSE WHO EXPLOIT DISORDER TO SEIZE THE POWER TO EXTINGUISH DISSENT.

AS A MEMBER OF THIS ADMINISTRATION, MY EARS ECHO WITH THE VOICES OF SXX DISSENT. YET I STAND BEFORE YOU TO ASSERT THAT I BELIEVE IN THE RIGHT OF DISSENT - NOT FOR SOME BUT FOR ALL.

AMERICA IS BUILT ON DISSENT. IT WAS BUILT BY THOSE WHO DISSENTED WITH THE WAYS OF OTHER LANDS TO CAXX COME HERE. IT WAS BUILT BY THE SIGNERS OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE WHO DISSENTED FROM THEIR MOTHER LAND. IT WAS BUILT BY MEN AND WOMEN WHO EVERY FOUR YEARS, WENT TO THE POLLS TO EXPRESS THEIR DISSENT FROM ONE ANOTHER. THIS GREAT STATE, IN WHICH I NOW SPEAK, WAS FOUNDED AND BUILT BY MEN AND WOMEN WHO DISSENTED FROM OTHER RELIGIONS AND OTHER LAWS. DISSENT IS THE DYNAMO OF A DEMOCRXXXXX DEMOCRACY.

WHEN THE PEOPLE OF A NATION CAN MOVE THEIR HEAD IN ONE DIRECTION ONLY- IN THE AFFIRMATIVE UP AND DOWN- THEN THE PEOPLE HAVE LOST THEIR FREEDOM. WE WANT A NATION WHERE THE PEOPLE CAN SAY NO AND WHERE THEY SAY NO INSTINCTIVELY TO THOSE WHO SEEK TO TURN ORDERLY POLICE POWER INTO A DISORDERLY POLICE STATE.

OUR POLITICAL DEMOCRACY RESTS ON THREE GREAT RIGHTS: FREEDOM OF SPEECH, FREEDOM OF ASSEMBLAGE, AND FREEDOM TO VOTE. A GOVERNMENT THAT DENIES THESE BASIC FREEDOMS IS ALSO A FORM OF TYRANNY OF A NOISY AND NOISOME MINORITY

4.
WHEN A GROUP OF HECKLERS, NO MATTER HOW RIGHTEOUS THEY MAY BELIEVE THEIR CAUSE TO BE, SHOUT DOWN A SPEAKER, THEY ARE DENIXXX DENYING THEM THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH. IF THEY BREAK UP A MEETING OR CONVENTION, THEY ARE DENYING THE FREEDOM OF ASSEMBLAGE. AND WHEN THEY THREATEN TO SIT-IN THE VOTING BOOTHS ELECTON DAY UNLESS FORCIBLY REMOVED THEY ARE DENYING THE FREEDOM TO VOTE.

IF THE TYRANNY OF A MAJORITY, IN THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT IS OPPRESSIVE THAN THE TYRANNY OF A MINORITY, IN THE FORM OF MOB ACTION, IS EQUALLY OPPRESSIVE.

DISORDER IS NOT DISSENT - INDEED, DISORDER - ESPECIALLY ORGANIZED DISORDER- IS THE ENEMY OF DISSENT. DESTRUCTION IS NOT DEBATE-INDEED THE VIOLENCE OF DESTRUCTION CAN ONLY SILENCE THE VITALITY OF A DEFA

IT IS POSSIBLE, NO DOUBT, TO EXPLAIN THE IMPATIENCE, EVEN INTOL-
ONE MOM SKIPPED & SCRAMPLED
WILL GO BACK

VITAL

ITY OF A DEBATE.

IT IS POSSIBLE, NO DOUBT, TO EXPLAIN THE IMPATIENCE, EVEN INTOL-
ERANCE, OF SOME REBEL YOUTH IN THE MANY LANDS WHERE THEY HAVE TURNED
DISSENT INTO DISORDER. BUT TO EXPLAIN IS NOT TO EXCUSE, ESPECIALLY IN
A LAND OF WHERE THE AVENUES OF PROTEST ARE OPEN. WE MAY EXPLAIN THEIR
XXXXXXEXPLOSIVE FEELINGS BUT WE VXX CANNOT EXCUSE THEIR EXCESSIVE
ACTIONS.

XXXXXX

A FREE SOCIETY CAN TOLERATE NEITHER A POLICE STATE NORMXXX NOR
MOB RULE. I SPEAK THESE HARSH TRUTHS- OUR TROUBLED AND CONFLICTED
WORLD, THE FLIGHT OF THE FEARFUL RULE OF REPRESSION, AND THE POLITICS
OF PROVOCATION - I SPEAK THESE HARSH TRUTHS, NOT BECAUSE THEY ARE
POPULAR, BUT BECAUSE THEY MUST BE SPOKEN. THEY MUST BE SPOKEN BEFORE
IT IS TOO LATE.

DENTIFICATION;

NY CIT FOR HHH

WHEN I STARTED THIS CAMPAIGN IXEXTATED STATED THAT EVEN IF IT COST
MY POLITICAL LIFE, I WILL MAKE NO COMPACT WITH EXTREMISIM. I REPEAT IT
NOW, BECAUSE NO ELECTION IS WORTH WINNING IF THE PRICE WE PAY IS OUR
FREEDOM.

IN THE CLASH BETWEEN EXTREMEISM LIES THE DANGER OF DEMOCRACY. THE
EXTREMES MEET ON A COMMON GROUND; THEY BOTH LIKE TO WIPE OUT THE MIDDLE.
THEY WOULD BOTH LIKE TO EMBITTER THE TOLERANT AND GENEROUS HEART OF
AMERICA; THEY WOULD BOTH LIKE TO HASTEN THE VIOLENT CONFRONTATION;
THEY WOULD BOTH LIKE TO SETTLE MATTERS BY RIOT RATHER THEN BY REASON.

I CALL UPON YOU TODAY TO TURN BACK THIS TIDE OF UNREASON. I CALL UPON
ON YOU TO REAFFIRM YOUR FAITH IN THE WAYS OF FREE MEN. I CALL UPON YOU
TO USE YOURXXXXX VOTES TO EXTERMINATE THE EXTREMISTS.

5. THE NATION HAS DONE IT BEFORE - AND IN OUR LIFETIME. BEFORE THIS PRESENT POLITICAL CRISIS WE WERE FACED A GENERATION AGO WITH AN ECONOMIC CRISIS. THE ECONOMY COLLAPSED AND SO DID OLD IDOLS AND IDEAS. MEN FELT FUTILE AND THEY WALKED IN FEAR. THE CRISIS WAS WORLD-WIDE AND, IN MANY LANDS, THE DAY OF THE DEMAGOGUE HAD FORMED.

THOSE OF YOU WHO LIVED THROUGH THE 1930'S KNOW THE STORY WELL, ONLY TOO WELL, AS DEMAGOGUES SOUGHT SCAPEGOATS ~~XXXXXX~~ TO BECOME DICTATORS, ENSLAVING THEIR OWN PEOPLE AND IMPERILING THE PEACE OF THE WORLD.

WE HAD OUR OWN DEMAGOGUES, TOO, PROMISING SIMPLE SOLUTIONS. BUT IN OUR OWN FASHION WE CHOSE ANOTHER WAY: THE WAY OF FREE MEN. WE WXXX ELECTED FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

HIS WAS NOT THE WAY OF REPRESSION BUT THE WAY OF REFORM. HE UNDERSTOOD THAT IT WAS A NEW DAY HE ENACTED A NEW DEAL. HIS ANSWER TO THE ECONOMIC CRISIS WAS NOT FEAR BUT FAITH, NOT HATE BUT HOPE, NOT BULLETS BUT BREAD.

WE FACED CRISIS BEFORE - AND WE TURNED THE CHAOS INTO CREATION. AND WITH YOUR HELP, WE WILL DO IT AGAIN.

#

END OF SPEECH.... ANY MISTAKES MADE...PLS EXCUSE..TRY TO MAKE OUT TO THE BEST OF U'RE ABILITY. THANK

NY CIT FOR HHH
~~XXXXXX~~
GA AND ACK OR END

NY CIT HHH/M END
DEM FOR HHH DC

NY CIT FOR HHH
SORRY WE WERE DISCONNECTED
ACK

YES WERE HERE BUT IM RUNNING 2 MACHINES

WAS THE MSG RECEIVED WITH NO SCRAMBLES OR PILINGS INIT?

YES IT WAS OUT
NY CIT FOR HHH

DEM FOR HHH DC



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