

Thank you Governor, while I adjust this microphone down to Minnesota size. Governor Connally and my dear Nellie, Mrs. Connally, and to each and everyone of you a very sincere hello and greeting.

First, I want to thank Bob Strauss for not only being with us but for getting me here. You were very kind to do so. I want to express my appreciation to my good friend, Carl Phinney, who is always with us, and doing such a magnificent job; and to Frank Irwin and Will Davis who joined us at the airport, to Jake Jacobsen, the man that we miss in Washington, but I'm sure is doing a splendid job here; and can I just make note for moment so that I don't forget that I saw in this audience "Tiger Teague". Where is Tiger? He's around here someplace. And I hope that I have my friend Graham Purcell here. Graham, are you here? That's good. Right back there. I was about to tell the truth on him and that's why he was hiding back there. I need to tell him just how happy I am to be in this district. I don't know whether my friend Jim Wright is around or not but if he isn't, you give him my greetings anyway. I did see one of the dearest ladies that we all know and love so much and that's Mrs. Albert Thomas, and I sure want to say hello to her.

Now, I don't want you to be upset about these papers. This is nothing but my schedule; it doesn't have any speech on it at all. It has some reminders to me that I'll speak to you about. It tells me what time I was supposed to start here, and this watch tells me what time I'm supposed to stop. And may I say that I generally ignore both. So, you will undoubtedly just have to bear with us.

The President has frequently advised me and counseled me on appearances such as this one. I recall some months ago when I was going over to speak to the radio broadcasters, I said to Mr. President, I was in his office about 6:00 o'clock, and he noticed that I was getting a little twitchy and nervous and he said: "What's wrong with you?" And I said: "Well, Mr. President there are several hundred radio broadcasters over at the Statler Hilton and I'd like to get over there to say a word to them." He said: "Well, what are they doing." I said: "Well, they are having a reception." He said: "Hubert, don't you know that there are three places you should never make a speech?" And I said: "What's that, Mr. President, that's a terrible limitation upon me?" He said: "Well, down Texas we always say you never speak at a barbecue, or a rodeo, or a cocktail party." And I, as usual, ignored most of the good advice. So, tonight I'm going to take some liberty with your understanding, and tolerance, and kindness and just say a few words to you.

Mr. Rostow was to be with us, Governor, as you have indicated. He is as you know, the Secretary for the National Security Council. And this is the highest Council of our government relating to our national security. He is a very close and intimate advisor to the President of the United States. Several of us in the government are on that Council. One of the privileges of the Vice-President is to serve on the National Security Council, as well as to be a member of the President's Cabinet. That was not always so. It became so right after World War II, when I think it was somewhat more understood and appreciated that there should be a very close relationship amongst all of us that have any responsibility in the executive levels of our government. I'm sorry that Mr. Rostow isn't here, because he is one of the most astute and profound scholars in our country, and

besides that, he is intimately acquainted with every aspect of our foreign policy and of our relationships on the diplomatic, economic, and military fronts. Tonight, I shall try to do the best I can as substitute for Mr. Rostow and then I'll speak for the Vice-President as well.

Now, you are not going to get two speeches in one, although I frequently do that, but I know that you are all standing, and even though we have been enjoying ourselves with some refreshments, I know that there is a limit to the ability of one who listens to a speech. I have no speech for you. I wanted to talk with you and visit with you. I've been with you before. Many of you know my deep commitment to this administration and to the President's program. I could talk to you about the things we are trying to do on the domestic scene, and I surely could visit with you about the whole gamut of our relationships on the international scene. These past two and a half days your President has been visiting with the Prime Minister of Great Britain. Great Britain, the United Kingdom, is one of our most loyal and faithful allies, and the Prime Minister has been a very great help to the President of the United States. I just left Mr. Wilson, Harold Wilson, about three and a half to four hours ago. It was my privilege to be first at breakfast with him this morning because the Prime Minister and his wife, Mary, are good friends of the Vice President and Muriel. By the way, may I say, before I go one minute further, that Muriel Humphery, my dear wife, is in Tulsa, Oklahoma. I hope she's doing a little good up there with those democrats. Maybe she is too, she's probably doing a lot better than her boy is doing down here. I miss her very much when I'm out on an occasion like this because if I stumble a little bit she always works the crowd and says "well, he's better on other occasions." These past better than two days, your President has been with the Prime Minister of Great Britain

discussing some very serious matters, our overall security, what we're doing in this world. Now, I'm not going to take time tonight to talk to you about the domestic scene. I'll simply say this, that in all of my work in the Senate, now as Vice President and in my travels around the world for your country and my country, for your President and my President, I find two common denominators. First of all, every country seeks national security. Every country, no matter how big it is, how little it is, where it is, whether it is Africa, Asia, Latin America, or here in the Western Hemisphere, we all seek the same thing, national security. Secondly, every country seeks in its own way national development. Now that national development concept includes many things. It includes economic roles in development, it includes education, it includes health, it includes all that we think about in terms of good life. But I want to leave this thought with you. You can not have national development without national security, and you cannot have national security without national development. They are one and inseparable. Or to put it in another way, our own domestic policy right here at home really tells what our foreign policy will be. America is as strong overseas as we are at home. When we are divided at home, it weakens our purpose abroad. Now I frequently take criticism because I tell audiences like this that those of us who love freedom, who believe in freedom of speech, who believe in the right to be heard and to talk, and to petition, who believe in the right to dissent, and we all do because we are dissenters, everyone of us at times, we have to also remember that every word we say, every action that we take, is no longer confined to our village, our city, our county, our state, or our country. It is broadcast throughout the world. And, one thing we must be very clear on is never to let the enemies of freedom believe that our

honest differences of opinion and discussion represent real disunity and dissention because it fools us. You know, I remember when we signed the Nato Treaty. I remember the speech of the late, beloved, Tom Connally, at that time Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, he said: "One of the reasons for this treaty is that we learned a lesson out of World War II that had we told Mr. Hitler early, a long time ago, that we would stand together, that an attack upon one would be an attack upon all, we might have spared ourselves that terrible blood bath and destruction of World War II." One of the reasons that we have joined in mutual security treaties around the world is to notify people that you can't get by with the law of the jungle, that if you attack this little country or that little country, that you in a sense trigger a larger operation, and that we are going to be there. We think that it is good diplomacy. We think that it is good morals. We think that it is sound policy to give those that would violate human dignity, national sovereignty, territorial integrity, to give them warning that if they do that they shall be met with all the power and all the influence and all the prestige that we can muster. Now, there are those that believe when you say that this indicates that you are bellicose or have an arrogance of power. Ladies and gentlemen, the worse thing that any great power can do is to deceive somebody. The worst thing that we can do for the life of humanity, for the rights of humanity, is to deceive people as to what is our purpose. I am not going to try and document it. I will just say this. There is no country on the face of the earth that has done more for the cause of peace than this country. No country. There is no country that has given more lives for others than this country, and there is no country that has spent more of its treasure to help other people help themselves than this country. Now I am not asking that we go out and beat our brass

and say "look how good we are." I am only saying this, that when we look at what we are doing in this world, I want you to balance off what you know that we have done that is good and well with that with which you may have some doubts, and may I say, I don't think it is wrong to ask Americans to give their country the benefit of the doubt. I really don't. One other thing I would like to observe, wherever I have been I find people no matter where they are or who they are - they want to be free. They want to be free of oppression, they want to be free of tyranny, they want to be free to make their lives. Now this is what this country stands for, and I don't think it is sentimentality, and I don't think it is emotional to say that the history of this Republic is the history of a people and a nation that has been committed to self determination, and for the right of people to make their own free choice. Now my fellow Americans, this has been a very difficult ten days - the last ten days. When I was here with you the last time I talked to you about my visit then, I think, to Southeast Asia. Since I have seen you last, I have been into Southeast Asia. I was to Viet Nam, to Indonesia, and to Malaysia, and I have been to nine countries in Africa, and let me tell you that in this most recent visit to Africa, in nine countries, traveling 25,000 miles, and by the way since I last saw you here I have been in 81 American cities, I have been in 20 some foreign countries, and I have been in three continents. I have traveled a great deal. I have seen the rich and I have seen the poor, the weak and the strong. I have been to the rural areas and back in the tribes and the bushes, and I have been in the great developed areas of American agriculture in the countryside. If there is one thing that the Vice President gets to do,

that is to observe what goes on, and I observe and I try to absorb as much as I can. These past few days have seen an increase in the violence, increase in the war, the intensity of the war in Viet Nam, beyond anything you expected. It is also seen off the Coast of Korea, North Korea, a serious challenge, not only to the law of nations but a serious challenge in this country. I know there will be questions on it. If you will permit me, I will do just this. No, I, on Viet Nam, what has happened was not unexpected. The intensity might have been underestimated. I am going to talk very confidentially to you, and I don't want a one of you to go out of here and tell the Press that the Vice President of the United States said this and said that, otherwise, I am not going to talk to you and I say this for one simple reason, we don't need a lot of interpretations from a dozen and twenty five different minds as to what is going on. This noon I was with the Secretary of State, this very wonderful Secretary of State, and let me tell you I don't care who his critics are, there hasn't been a man that served his country more faithfully than Dean Rusk. I said to the Secretary, "I am going to be in Dallas, and I am not going to ask you what I can say, I just want to know what can't I say, because the President has enough problems without the Vice President of the United States adding to them by some statement or some comment that might cause misunderstanding." So, I know what I can't say. Frankly, I did not have many rules laid down, but let's take a look. Tet, now what is Tet in the Vietnamese culture? Tet is Christmas, New Year's, Yom Kipper, Hanukah, and Mother's Day all put together. That's what it is, if you know what I mean. All put together, it is their holiday. Now Tet has been the period just as we saw in the great war of World War II, when the enemy, even with Hitler's Germany, when there was some

relaxation of the violence for Christmas, when there was for at least a few hours a truce. The North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong said we're going to have a truce over Tet, and they talked about it for seven days, two weeks, and all sorts of things. It was understood that finally it would come down to at least about two days. This government of South Viet Nam observed that Tet period. That's their great religious, social, city holiday. The Armed Forces of the United States, as an ally to the government of South Viet Nam, said we would observe it. Now we had expected an attack either before Tet or after Tet. And very candidly, our forces were on the alert for the possibility of an attack during Tet, but we were not attacking. We were not bombing; we were not firing. Three hours after the hour of Tet arrived, at 3:00 A. M. in the morning, a vicious, terrifying, cruel attack is launched upon 38 - 24 major cities and 14 minor - cities throughout the entire area of South Viet Nam by the enemy. Now the American reaction first of all was how could they do it. Well, ladies and gentlemen, let me tell you, as the President said the other day, we have 300 policemen guarding the White House and there are many secret service men, and yet this last year there were twelve times that would-be assassins of the President got over the fence and into the compound. There isn't any way that you can protect yourself from that kind of stuff. These Viet Cong were ordered under very carefully prepared operations, and we ought to know the nature now of this enemy, very carefully prepared operations to strike simultaneously all across the land at a time when fifty percent of the Armed Forces under the understanding of a truce for Tet were on their way home to see their loved ones. It's like Christmas Eve, my dear friends, it's like Christmas Eve and Easter, as I said, it is the combination, it is like Christmas Eve and Yom Kipper.

It's everything. And, this enemy struck with ferocity. Now what I want to say to you is, how come someone in this country didn't say: "What a cruel, inhuman, indecent act on the part of the enemy?" Why is it that the suspicion and the doubt was upon us and our allies? But what was the purpose of this attack? First, to terrorize the country; secondly, not merely to attack the cities, my fellow Americans, and this is what I want you to know, but to attack the cities, to hold the cities, to establish a new regime in the cities, and to oust the government of South Viet Nam. Now we know that. I read before I came here today, and I deeply regret because of our haste in departure, that I didn't bring you the intelligence reports which I feel that you ought to see. Every morning of my life, I read the same documents as your President reads. Every morning I get all the cables that come in from all around this world. And I read this morning at 7:00 A. M. the analysis that came from the combined intelligence operation of ourselves and our allies and our ambassador and the best people we have of all the captured documents, all the interviews of the prisoners, that have been taken in the struggle in South Viet Nam. Now what was the purpose of the VC's, of NVA, the North Vietnamese? The purpose of the communist, let's put it what it is. What was their purpose? First of all not only to terrorize the country; secondly, to occupy the cities; thirdly, to establish a government in the cities called the Revolutionary Administration, and fourthly, to overthrow the government in Saigon. And, in the process of doing so, to assassinate hundreds of the district leaders, the military leaders, to blow up the establishment of the military establishment, their Pentagon, etc. Now what happened? They attacked, they even went into our own embassy. Ladies and gentlemen, you can have five hundred policemen

right out here around this building and if there are some people disguised as you are, looking just as you do, that are willing to give their lives and are willing to walk into this building, there isn't a thing anybody can do to prevent it; and nineteen people dressed in civilian clothes and in the police uniform of South Vietnamese waited their time till 3:00 A. M. in the morning and went to the compound of the American Embassy and blew a hole in the wall and went on inside, and all nineteen of them were dead by the next afternoon. Yet we have been having people tell us that they won a victory. I don't call that any victory, not one bit. They did prove that they could penetrate. I'm here to tell you that any bank robber in America can prove that he can penetrate a bank, but he won't live long. I can tell you that any one of the many people can prove that they can perpetrate violence, but it doesn't mean that they will get by with it; and in 24 major cities and 14 other populated areas, 38 in all, the Viet Cong tried to take over the country. Now what can result? Number One, not a single unit of the army of the South Vietnamese defected. Not one, not one single defection of a unit of the entire army of South Viet Nam that you have heard so many criticisms about. They fought bravely. Not one single village tonight is occupied by the enemy. Oh yes, they have a few in Hue up in the North, Hue the old imperial capital, and why is it it takes so long? I'll tell you why, ladies and gentlemen, the enemy, the Viet Cong, has occupied the most sacred pagoda in all of Viet Nam. It would be as if the enemy had occupied in Italy the Vatican, and you ask people of Catholic faith to attack it. So, they go in one by one and are running out the enemy without destroying that great religious edifice. And, block by block, in street fighting, the enemy is being defeated. In Saigon, in the suburb, one suburb there is still Viet Cong. But not a single

major city is in the hands of the enemy. Not a single Arvan Unit defected or betrayed its cause. And the government of South Viet Nam still is intact in the National Assembly. Their Congress is still meeting and in fact, Governor, they even passed a resolution to investigate why the enemy had been so successful. Now some people can call that Communist victory if they want to, but I don't call it that. Because the purpose of their attack was not merely to destroy; the purpose was to overthrow the government and take the country. That's what they told their people. Now I don't know if my secretary is here with my little notebook or not, but I wanted to be sure of my figures because I don't believe that I ought to deceive anybody in any way or in any way even come close to having a wrong figure. (Have you got that Norma - come here.) I want you to know about casualties now. What would you think if the morning newspaper carried a story that said 26,000 Americans have been killed in action, six thousand or five thousand had been captured, and then Lyndon Johnson claimed a victory? I can tell you what would happen. Congress or somebody would induce a resolution of impeachment. They don't mind saying some pretty mean things as it is. Well, listen to this; this is the report as of Wednesday 11:00 A. M., right from the field headquarters of General Westmoreland, killed in action United States troops since this offensive started - 670. Wounded - 3,565. Of the Arvan, that's the army of the Republic of Viet Nam, killed in action - 1,294. Wounded - 4,448. Now we know, because those bodies are counted, and the wounded are cared for. The enemy killed in action, that we have been able to count, this doesn't include what we know can happen from bombing, and we've dropped more bombs in the past week on the area around Queson in the Northeast in the past week than we've dropped in any one month in all of Europe in World War II. And we have witnessed 500 secondary explosions, which means that

there has been something hit. Now the enemy lost 24,199 as of Wednesday noon two days ago, 5,007 prisoners who are being interrogated, the weapons captured are 6,216. Now how do we know that these figures are reliable? Because immediately, the point gets right up - don't believe anybody in your government. There's a real felling in this country, don't believe us, just believe Ho Chi Minh, the biggest liar in Asia, just believe him. As I say to many people, "what do you think I want to lie to you for, or your President? What is it that makes the communish propaganda so sacred?" When they say these figures aren't right, people doubt these figures, well then here's why we say these figures are reasonably right, and I'm willing to give you a 20 percent overestimate one way or the other and that will leave 20,000 still of the enemy that was killed in action. But here is what our record is for two and one half years, the record is that for every weapon captured four are killed in action, now why? Because many of the weapons are steel pieces, they are mortars, they are rockets, and it takes any where from three to eight men to handle them and bring them in. We captured almost 1,000 heavy weapons, so we know that in the heavy weapon field there was a very large number of people. One to four is the ratio, so if you had 6,000 captured weapons for two and a half years of statistical averages that we kept, that means 24,000 killed in action. Now I'm willing to give you 5,000 one way or another, but I want to ask you - if the enemy has lost 20,000, and we have lost by our own count 670, and we are not lying to the mothers of this country because these bodies come home, can you call this a victory? What is this that we are telling the world? And Ho Chi Minh's Hanoi radio repeats time after time to its people and to the people in South Viet Nam, the Americans admit they have suffered a colossal defeat, because we talk that way. We haven't had any defeat. It's a miserable war. We don't

like war, but I want to tell you ladies and gentlemen that there is one thing you can be sure of - the enemy uses propaganda as a weapon as surely as we use a gun as a weapon. When they can tell their own people from our own lips, and our own printed word, that we have suffered a defeat, that our country is divided, that somehow or other things are going bad, their people live on it. Remember Ho Chi Minh has had as his dream all of his life a communist Viet Nam, and he is getting old. And he wants it in his lifetime. He's not going to get it. He is not going to get it! There are no Humphreys in the Old or New Testament, I've looked to the very back. And I'm not going to be a prophet. But I'll tell you this, don't sell your country short. I know this, that we are prepared for whatever eventuality can beset us. I'm not at all sure what is going to happen upon the Demilitarized Zone, the enemy may break through someplace, but he can't win, and you need to know that. I would give a strong plea here as it is in my heart for the cause of peace, because that's my whole life - I'm not a warrior. I know that there are very few words of scripture that say blessed are the war makers. But there are some words that say blessed are the peace makers. But as I have said from other platforms, the peace makers not the peace wishers or the peace paraders or the peace talkers, but the peace makers. And quite candidly, I think that sometimes nations have to stand strong and suffer great pain even for peace. I'm sure that we were making peace when we stood against Hitler and the Japanese militarists. We weren't trying to engage war for the love of war; it was for peace. And we stood for peace when we stood for Korea in 1950 to 1952, we didn't stand for war. And we're standing there now, and we're strengthening our forces there, and we're strengthening the Koreans there. Not for war, but for peace. And your President is exercising great restraint, utilizing

every known means of diplomacy, to release the Pueblo and its crew. He's not interested in war. We're interested in the lives of that crew. We're interested in the return of that ship, but we are also interested, may I say, in the fulfillment of any commitment that we have to the protection of the security and the freedom of our allies and ourselves. Now ladies and gentlemen, let's make it clear right now that if this great nation runs and tucks tail just because there are some bullies at loose in this world, if we do that now, there will never be any peace, never be any peace. And not a living mortal wants peace more than the President of the United States. If you think you worry, if you think your heart is heavy, let me tell you I know somebody who worries more, and somebody else whose heart is very heavy, and that's the President of the United States. Let's give him our confidence, our applause.

(Governor John Connally)

Mr. Vice President, we don't want to unduly burden you here, but there are some questions that I think are interesting that perhaps you can address yourself to. The first one is: Need we be concerned over South Korea's attitude toward the United States right now?

Vice President Humphery:

A. I don't think we need to be concerned in the real attitude of South Korea. There are people in every country that are very emotional. There were some young students recently on Freedom Bridge that wanted to literally assail the American troops. We have some young students every once in a while in our own country that do a few things. The South Korean government is our loyal ally. This whole Pueblo attack was coordinated, and it was synchronized with what's going on in Viet Nam. The purpose of this attack was to get the two Korean divisions that are now in South Viet Nam out of South Viet Nam. That's number one. Secondly, the capture of the USS Pueblo was related to the assassination attempt upon the President of South Korea. At least communists are delightful fellows, aren't they? 2500 people that are trained for an assassination team. I want this to be perfectly clear the kind of enemy we have. I have been to Korea four times since I've been your Vice President. I was there last July, I met with the Prime Minister. I saw the Prime Minister of Korea in Viet Nam this October. He told me of the incidence along their border, the infiltration, we've lost 300 men in Korea this year. There have been over 500 intrusions of the border, attacked from North Korea. That South Korean government is our ally. Let me give you a little intimate bit of information. President Johnson wrote to the President of South Korea this last week. I was with the President the night he signed the letter. Our ambassador in Seoul, Korea said that when the President of South Korea read the letter - he broke down

and wept in gratitude. These are loyal people, faithful people, good allies, and I want my fellow Americans to know they are not standing alone, and we haven't exactly been sending them Cracker Jack lately. We've been doing our best. Don't worry, they'll be alright, and we're alright with them.

Mr. Vice President, a little change of pace. What effect would Governor Wallace's candidacy have on the 1968 election?

Vice President Humphery:

A. This would bring me back to the hard reality of life. Well, I'm going to be very candid with you, I think it would greatly depend upon what we do. I think what we do, not what President Johnson does, not what the Vice-President does, I can guarantee you that we'll do our best, but if the loyal democrats and if independents in this country, who believe in the cause of this nation and what the President is trying to do at home and abroad, will stand with us, George Wallace will be no more effective than another Wallace was, named Henry Wallace in 1948. I might add in all confidence that I doubt that he will weaken our cause as much as he may the Republican cause, but I don't want to count on that. I don't want anybody to be giving us any favors, I want us to earn this victory. And I want you to really get yourself geared up to go on out and do a real Texas size job!

This question relates to proposals now before the Congress. The President has proposed a possible travel tax which might include a ten to twelve dollar tax each day if one is out of the country. Certain people might easily pay this, but would this not be discriminatory against students who go over on students' ships and so forth as the tax would be to cut down on overseas spending, should not the people who spend the most overseas, that is the tourists, be taxed the most? The student often just spends five dollars a day.

Vice President Humphery:

A. Well, just let me say a word about the tourist tax. I talked with Secretary Fowler today, I was teasing him a little bit about this myself, to be honest with you, and I said: "Well, Joe, how's the tourist business?" He said: "I'll tell you one thing Hubert, we have more people in America interested in seeing America and more people interested in getting those well-to-do European people to come see us than any time in our history by the threat of this tax." Now I'm convinced, first of all we're not going to pass any tax bill to discriminate against student exchange, you can put that down right now. That's not going to be, and that's not the purpose of the President's program, and it will not do that. There are some exemptions in it. There are all kinds of exemptions for the Western Hemisphere. And by the way, it wouldn't be a bad idea to get acquainted with some of our friends in the Western Hemisphere. You can travel just as much as your living heart wants to get you to travel around here. I'm convinced that when the Congress gets through with this that most of the tax that is levied if it is levied at all, and we've had a little trouble with Congress on taxes, will be not upon those who spend just a few dollars a day, but upon the big spenders. Now we've got to cut down our travel deficit. I don't want to make any prediction about what a tax will be like. I will make this prediction so that my friends who sent this question in will know there will be nothing happen in terms of our travel program that will in any way restrict that frugal, prudent, self-sacrificing school teacher, student, and grandson and granddaughter that wants to see grandpa and grandma. That will not be the case, you're not going to be the ones that are going to be hurt. But in the meantime I'm going to make a suggestion to you -- tell people to come see Texas.

Mr. Vice-President, we're trying to tell them that. We hope you put in a good word for us wherever you go because -

Vice President Humphery: San Antonio!!

you know we have . . . (laughter) the Hemisfair beginning April 6. Well, you're known Mr. Vice-President for being awfully fast on your feet and being well-informed about almost every subject. Let's try this one on you. What about the possibility of raising the ceiling on FHA and VA interest rates so that we builders can provide homes for lower income groups? I assume we have a builder in the crowd. (Laughter).

Vice President Humphery:

A. Well, as a matter of fact we have raised the interest rate on some of the FHA and VA loans. I'm not familiar with all the details, and I learned one thing a long time ago, that if you don't know, it doesn't hurt to admit it and then just to go and try to find out. Now if that builder who sent that question in, or if that buyer who sent that question in, but I think it's a builder, if he'll see me just a little bit later, I'll get somebody in my office who knows much more about these things than I do, and we will give you an answer. Thank you very much.

Here's one I think you've already answered, but I'll read it. Are we actually winning militarily in South Viet Nam? I think you've answered that very well -

Vice President Humphery: The best I could.

Here are a couple more on the same subject generally. First, will we mobilize any ground reserve component units?

Vice President Humphery:

A. We have no such plans. By the way, the mobilization of the air reserves that we've had were merely to replace those units that went from this country not to Viet Nam, but to Korea. We have sent a number

of our air force units to Korea to bolster that defense structure there because we think that's wise and prudent and necessary, and the reserves are only here called up to take those places. If the world scene does not change for the worse, I don't see that we will be mobilizing any ground reserves. I don't think one ought to say definitively, because I can't predict what the enemy will do.

We have two more, Mr. Vice President. They deal generally in the same subject. I'll read them both and I think you can address yourself to them at the same time. First, do you believe there's any possibility of us getting out of Viet Nam any time soon and bringing our boys back home? How long can we continue two wars, a fighting war against the Viet Cong in Viet Nam and the vigorous war against poverty at home?

Vice President Humphery:

A. Well, now you know that last question I think is one that is very much in the minds of many people. We don't have an instant solution to the war in Viet Nam or the war on poverty at home. Many times when the question is asked, it requires -- it seems to require the person responding to give you the solution. Now I can't predict to you what time the war in Viet Nam will be over, I can only predict to you it will be. I know that it will not be over any sooner, if we seem to have an indecisive attitude about our involvement in it. As to the war on poverty -- we're doing more on that question today than has ever been done in the history of this country. I won't burden you with many figures, I'll only tell you this -- that if you look back to see what we have been doing in health and education - two areas - in 1961 as compared to 1968, in 1961, the last year of the Republican Administration, the total expenditures in those areas were about \$3,800,000,000.00. Under President Johnson \$15,900,000,000.00. Now

I know some people think that isn't enough, but I've met a lot of people who think it's too much. All I can tell you is, that it is four times more than anybody else ever dared do, and we're doing the best that we know how to do within the limitation of our resources. Now this is an \$800,000,000,000 economy. At the end of this year that economy will be about \$850,000,000,000. Each year it generates about another 11 to 12 billion dollars in tax revenues. I think we can afford to do what we are doing and I'm going to lay it on the line, ladies and gentlemen. (Applause). The people who are sacrificing in this war in Viet Nam are the people who have a son there. I don't want to be unkind, but listen ladies and gentlemen, there hasn't been any rationing, no police control, no wage control, there hasn't been an increase in taxes. Let's just face it. Let's just turn around and look at ourselves for a minute. What have we sacrificed? We haven't put up an extra nickel. And what your President is asking for is a modicum, a very limited amount so that we can keep our dollar at a purchasing power that it ought to be, that we can protect the value of the dollar in the international markets, and that we can pay for some of the things that need to be done here at home and at the same time pay for some of the costs of international security abroad. I think the President has been a very restrained man. He hasn't come to labor, or business, or the consumer, or the producer and said you are going to be regulated. We have no censorship. This is the first war in the history of this America that has been fought without censorship, the first time. The only censorship I know is private censorship and I know that most of the news that I get is bad news. Seldom do you get much good news. I work with young people a great deal and I hear an awful lot about all their excesses. Ladies and gentlemen, I see young people that are doing such wonderful things, I wonder when they

are going to get front copy and not get on television. I still believe that if we have the will to prosecute these two struggles abroad and at home, we have the resources, and as the President said in his State of the Union Address. Some people said, "well, he didn't lay out too much of a program." Last year when he laid out one they said it was too much of a program. I want to tell you something. That if I ever had any desire to be President, I'm sure losing it fast, after last night. (Applause).

Mr. Vice President, you're always magnificent, always magnificent. Let's show him how much we really appreciate him being here tonight. (Great applause).



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