

ADDRESS AT GEORGE PEPPERDINE COLLEGE
 BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY
 Los Angeles, California
 September 25, 1968

- - -

MODERATOR: Ken Hahn
 QUESTION & ANSWER PANEL: Thomas Bradley, Member, City Council,
 City of Los Angeles; President, League
 of California Cities for Los Angeles
 County.

David Hayward, Member, Southern Cali-
 fornia Rapid Transit District.

Kenneth Nakaoka, Mayor, Gardena,
 California.

- - -

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Thank you, President Young, thank you my good friend, Supervisor Ken Hahn, Speaker Unruh, members of the panel, and ladies and gentlemen. This is a very happy day for me, a somewhat unusual one, but also a very rewarding one. First of all, I am on a college campus. I love to be here, both as a student -- I am an honorary student of this college now -- and as a faculty member -- I am a honorary faculty member. I received a honorary lunch card and I have already used it. I have a free lunch every time I am here.

To be with members of the board, the faculty, the president of this college and the student body is a special delight, and then to be with the local officials of the county and the localities, members of the local press, is also a very special privilege. My work sort of fits into both of these categories. I have never quit feeling that I was a teacher, at least that I wanted to be one. I have been a college teacher and have been a student and have had the privilege of being honored by many colleges and universities. In the last four years, I have served as the President's liaison officer with the local government officials of this country. I have worked very closely with Supervisor Hahn and with the members of the county board here in Los Angeles, with all of the mayors. I have had over 50 meetings in four years with the mayors, the city managers, the councilmen, the county officials, and state legislative officials. This has been one of the most demanding and yet one of the most challenging parts of my service as Vice President. I believe that I am the first Vice President that ever had that responsibility and I have entered into it with zest and with a feeling that I would learn more from my contact with the local officials than they would learn from me.

Some of you may have received our handbook for local government, and might I say that if you have not, it is a special book that I prepared. First I used to teach local government as a professor of political science, and American government. I sometimes feel I owe all my students a refund, after having been in American government and having remembered what I taught.
 (Applause)

I would like to suggest to any of you that have not received a

copy of the Handbook for Local Government Officials that if you would like one, you write to the office of the Vice President in Washington and we will try to see that you get one. This handbook describes all the federal programs that are available to local government officials and what they are, how you apply for them, what the limitations are under authorizations and appropriations; in other words, what I tried to do was to recognize that everybody does not have a Harvard lawyer at his side to interpret the federal regulations and to describe to you what these programs are. I looked upon the Federal Government as a sort of a large supermarket in which there were a number of goodies, but there were no labels on the boxes. And people would come in, staggering around, so to speak, with the lights turned off, trying to find what they needed, particularly if you come from a smaller community. So we have tried to do something about that.

I met with the city managers to talk to them about the needs of public administration. I have spent many times and hours, as Ken Hahn will tell you, with the county officials at your national conventions, with your legislative committees, working on problems of local government and their relationship to the services of the Federal Government.

When we speak of government, we do not speak of government in Washington or Sacramento alone, we speak of government -- federal, national capital, state capital, courthouse, city hall, and even up in my part of the country where I live, township hall. I live in Marysville Township and my main problem is trying to get the township to blacktop the road. If I can get that done, I will have had a singular achievement in the art of local government.

Ken Hahn said just see your supervisor. But you do not understand that in my county, Wright County, the county board refuses to take any jurisdiction over township roads.

He does all the city's work as well, he said.

One other observation, then we will turn to the panel. Government in the United States is not a doctrine or a dogma or a formula. This is why to understand American government, you have to experience it. There is no way that you can really describe it except through living with it. The Federal Government has had to improvise under the impact of change; so has state and local government. We have gone through very significant changes recently with court decisions that require one man and one vote, redistricting, the impact of a nation, of a development in the nation that has changed from rural to urban society. How do we bring along the tone of government so that what was once rural, which now is urban -- that those who administer government, the civil servants, feel the change that must come because of the reality of the change that is here?

We sometimes call it in sociology the social lag. And I suppose there is such a thing and we see it at work. But there is no place in the world where people are as attuned to and as skilled in the art of self government as in the United States. And the reason is quite simple: Because we have such a vast number of governmental jurisdictions that require citizenship, knowledge,

and participation.

Now, we have the critics of our system: If you want an efficient system, then you should not have democracy. Remember what Winston Churchill once said: The worse form of government -- democracy is the worse form of government except all others -- except all others.

And when I hear people talking about the word "efficiency," while I am sure that it is important, I would remind you it is one word that does not appear either in scriptures, the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, the Gettysburg Address, the Emancipation Proclamation -- as far as I know, it is a word that has been applied to most things outside of human relations. And government in a democracy is essentially the art of human relations. That is why those of us who are involved in this must not look upon ourselves as computers, but rather men and women of spirit, of flesh and blood and mind. And we try to learn how to accommodate you.

Our resources, with the needs of the public, without sacrificing that precious thing in free society called the individual, the whole purpose of any institution in a free society is what does it mean to the individual? It is only moral justification, whether it is an economic system, a political system, an education system or a social system, its only justification is, does it enrich the life of the individual? Because it is the dignity of the individual that characterized a free society and differentiates it from a totalitarian society.

As an old student and teacher of American government, I used to remind my students of one thing, that in order to understand freedom, you had to understand religion. God created man in his own image. (Applause.)

I would have my students put their books aside for a couple of weeks and I said, now, let's talk about what we mean by freedom. What do we mean by individualism? Why should you have the right to vote? Sometimes you vote very foolishly. Why should you have the right to speak? Sometimes you say things no one ought to say. Why should you assemble? Sometimes assemblies do as much harm as good.

Why? You and I know we ought to have the right to vote, to assemble, to speak, to worship -- why?

The answer is spiritual, not political. The answer is that God created man in his own image, differentiating man from beast. And because man has been created with a spark of the Divine in him, no man has the right to control that other man without his consent. There is a spark of decency, of individuality, of human dignity in every person -- not because of his flesh, not because of his blood, not even because of his mind, but because of his soul. (Applause)

And ultimately, we must judge everything that we do relating to that individual by what it does for his enrichment, for his betterment. And that, by the way, knows no color, no race, no creed. There is no room in a free society for those cardinal sins of bigotry and of discrimination and of intolerance. Those

sins have no place in a free society. (Applause)

MR. HAHN: Mr. Vice President, I want you to know this is still a non-partisan meeting. You would think we are a Democratic rally the way they are cheering.

I met one of the very distinguished mayors of one of the third largest cities in the county. He told me the county clerk, the city administrator, city manager, the city attorney are here, there are more local people here than there are in the city. He thinks he might hold the meeting where he can have a quorum in 12 states combined. With the seven million people that are here in Los Angeles County, it is larger than 12 states combined of the nation.

Here, you get the list of the states involved and I want -- I told him there are more people here than North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, Delaware, Minnesota --

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I figured you would get to that.

MR. HAHN: That is what you see of local officials. If you had to go to all the states in the Union, you are meeting more local officials in this room than in half of the end of Northern California -- oh, no states.

You know, I like the way the Vice President spoke. He spoke from his heart. He spoke as an academic man, a teacher, a man who is interested in our country and our history, and the spiritual values of this nation. This is what the college was founded upon. George Pepperdine founded this college in 1937 on academic freedom in a Christian environment. I know if he were alive, he would be very pleased that you spoke from this auditorium on the very ideals that he gave his money and his fortune to establish his college so that students could have division and debate and dissent but have it in an atmosphere of real academic freedom.

Don't you appreciate this attitude of the Vice President?
(Applause)

I would like to have now Councilman Tom Bradley, who will speak on some activity of local government, address this assembly and then to ask the Vice President for comments or ask your question.

Mr. Tom Bradley, Member of the City Council of the City of Los Angeles; former police lieutenant of the Los Angeles Police Department; and the President of the League of California Cities for Los Angeles County. (Applause)

MR. BRADLEY: Thank you, Ken.

Mr. Vice President, I suppose Ken expected that I might make a long speech. I don't plan to do that. I think this audience is here to hear from you. I want to permit them to get to that by asking you a very tough question to begin with. It deals with the crisis in our cities.

For the past three years at least, I know that elected officials who represent city government all over this land have been

concerned about the growing crisis in our cities. We hear talk about the order of priority at the local level as well as at the federal level. My question to you is how can we possibly reorder priorities here, deal with our problems, so long as we continue to pour the great resources of this nation, for example, into the space race or into the war in Viet Nam? My question is how do you propose to handle that problem? Can we effectively deal with these urgent problems that face us in local government when we have to spend that much money on these other issues?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I should try to come directly to your point, Councilman. This is a question that perplexes all of us. Of course, we first must say that if you didn't have to, if we were not spending the monies that we are in Viet Nam, and if the Congress would be willing to take that same amount of money that you are spending in Viet Nam and put it to the problems of our cities, of course, we would have a much, much better situation than we have today.

But I must be very candid with you that I was in the Congress after the war in Korea. I started in Congress in 1949 as a member of the Senate. When the war in Korea was over and the peace came, we didn't spend any money on our cities. We didn't have any poverty program, we didn't have any federal aid to education. We didn't have any program of water pollution control. We didn't have any mass transit program, we didn't have anything. What they did was reduce taxes and the so-called peace dividend ended up in three recessions which took their toll right out here in California in eight years, costing an average of \$50 billion a year in loss of gross national product because of the failure to use plant capacity -- \$175 billion over eight years in lost wages because of unemployment. And we still didn't have anything going on for our cities. The war was over. The armistice was signed, the troops were brought home. But nothing happened in the cities and nothing happened in the schools.

Now, that is a fact. I was in Congress when that went on. I saw the other day, for example, where my opponent said that had we passed all the programs that Vice President Humphrey has been advocating, it would have cost this country \$100 billion, all the programs he has advocated from 1949 to 1964, when I became Vice President.

I think that may be some exaggeration, but let's take the figure and take him at his word. The fact is that a number of those programs did pass. But what is more important is that \$175 billion was lost through economic recessions that took their toll in every community. So we could have paid all the programs that I sponsored and had \$75 billion left over had we been able to continue the kind of economic progress that we have enjoyed in these eight years. (Applause)

Here are the facts. In 1960, we spent approximately \$3 billion on our city programs. In fiscal 1968, which is the last year that we had full figures for, we spent \$9.3 billion -- a 300 percent increase despite the war in Viet Nam -- on programs that related directly to our cities -- community facilities, streets, urban renewal, the programs that went directly into cities.

The poverty program -- and that includes, of course, funds that would come under welfare for instance, unemployment compensation -- 1960, we spent \$9 billion. Last year, 26.9 -- excuse me, \$26.7 billion. We have increased the social budget of this country, which is one of the reasons that some people are complaining. I might just as well say it for the opposition, because they will bring it up anyway. We have increased the social budget of this country since 1945 by \$40 billion out of the federal government. That is \$40 billion. That is increased Social Security payments, aid to cities, aid to education, health, et cetera.

Now, we have tripled federal aid to education from \$3 billion to \$12.4 billion. We have increased the aid in health by 300 percent, from \$4 billion to \$12.6 billion -- no, about \$13.2 billion, excuse me. So we have been at work, but we haven't done enough.

Now, what are we going to be able -- you mentioned the space program. I want to say right now that the space program is not a luxury. You cannot afford, my fellow Americans, to be second in space, either for security or for education, or for industry. (Applause) The space program is a favorite whipping boy. I have been Chairman of the Space Council and my homelife has been primarily dedicated to such things as education and health and consumer protection, things like that. I am a so-called domestic liberal and everybody knows it and I have had to take all the darts and arrows that come from that kind of a position. But I have supported the space program and I haven't done it because I thought it was just something I had to do. This was something that I had something to say about. Vice presidents don't have very much that they can say. (Applause)

But I have been Chairman of the Space Council and I have coordinated the activities of our space program. I am familiar with it. That space program has given American industry a lead in competition with the rest of the world that is known as the technological gap between our country and other countries, because we have been able to take much of our technological achievements in the space program and apply them to what we call peacetime industry.

For example, miniaturization. Miniaturization in America is a tremendous asset to American industry. The computer has given American industry a 10 year lead on all other competitive industries. That is why European countries today are begging us for this kind of technology. They have never had it to the degree that we have had it. The space program has done more to promote excellence in universities in the sciences and the life sciences -- the natural sciences, the physical sciences, the life sciences -- than any single program we have had. It has done more to break down the strict compartmentalization of universities where the department of biology seldom ever spoke to the department of physiology or where the department of economics never ever spoke with the department of life sciences. We have forced, literally, universities to do what we call interdisciplinary organization, to pool their resources. And the American university today is the wonder of the world. The standards of teaching and of study are so far ahead of the rest of the world there isn't any comparison. And much of it is due

to the fact that the science programs, the research and development programs of your government, running today at the rate of approximately \$15 billion to universities and to business, has given a tremendous push to this kind of interdisciplinary activity.

Now, there is one other thing that I would like to mention, that we can continue these programs for our urban crisis and must. Our model cities program -- I have advanced the Marshal Plan for our cities, Mr. Councilman. That plan sets up what we call a national urban development bank.

Now, what is the purpose of that? To provide the revenues, the monies that are needed on a steady, long-term basis. The Congress some years appropriates \$2 billion for the housing program, \$3 billion for the urban program. Next year, it appropriates \$1 billion for the housing program, \$1.5 billion for the urban program, and no one can ever make any plans. Your plans are held in abeyance.

In the meantime, the cost of materials goes up, the loss of manpower, your plans are changed. All kinds of things happen. Urban renewal is characteristic of what I am talking about.

Throughout many of our great cities in America today, there are whole vast areas staked out for urban renewal, where you lost your taxes, where people leave the businesses and they become wastelands. Why? Because there wasn't the followthrough with appropriations.

Now, I am advocating that we establish for the domestic scene what we have done for the international scene. We have a world bank that helps finance great international and national developments in the world scene and we are a member, we of the United States. We have a large amount of stock in that bank. That bank also sells stock on the open market, just exactly as the Interamerican Development Bank of which we are a member. We have a capital stock in that bank as a government. We bought a share of that bank. But we also have an Interamerican Development Bank board which goes into the money markets and sells its own stock.

This is the way we started out with the Federal Land Bank. The Federal Government bought the main capital stock. Today the Federal Land Bank is private, not government.

The bank I have proposed after some study and working with the best financial men in America would have a substantial United States Government stock ownership to start off. In other words, if government would buy a block of stock in it, let's say a billion dollars, \$2 billion, \$3 billion, whatever amount the Congress might decide. Then that bank would be authorized to sell stock in the open market up to 5, 10, 15, 25 billion dollars. The government would guarantee, as it does in overseas investments, those stocks, just as the government today guarantees your bank deposits. That bank would have its own board of directors, it would be quasi public and quasi private. It would have a charter with a purpose stated in the charter. And that bank would be available to Supervisor Hahn, to Councilman Bradley, to the mayor of any community, for you to go to instead

of going to the Congress to get your money for your program under your model cities or whatever it is. You could go to the Congress to get whatever you could, but you would go to the bank that had a specific purpose and get the bulk of your financing and you would be able to do it over an extended period of time. We are never going to meet the urban crisis on a crisis basis. We are going to meet it on a very carefully planned, designed, long-term basis, but we have got to get at it.

This is what I called the Marshall Plan. Why? Because the Marshall Plan after World War II had three requirements -- first, a commitment to do the job; secondly, a 5-year program so that you knew the time frame in which you had to work; and third, that the recipient of the loans and the grants as well as the donor had to come to an agreement on the programs so that the planning was done on the local level and it had to work under certain guidelines and standards set down at the donor level or the lending level. And the Marshall Plan was in a very real sense a very businesslike proposition. And it worked. And it worked because, of course, one other thing. It was working with people who knew how to use capital, who had management skill. Our cities know how to use capital. We have management skill. My National Urban Development Bank would provide additional technical assistance, management skill. You would get away from the hit and miss, the in and out, the conservatism, the liberalism of the Congress and you would start to do your urban development on a systematic long-term basis on which you would have a private input of capital, because there is no city in America that is going to be saved out of public funds. Ultimately, it will have to be rebuilt from private sources with the public fund being the catalytic agent to get the program underway.

MR. HAHN: In the first two rows, I want you to know, are the publishers and editors of the most important newspapers in the United States. They are the communities and the dailies of this county. I am not talking about the big downtown newspapers but I am talking about the real backbone of America, the communities and the dailies. I am very proud that they are here.

By the way, they all supported me at the last election. I like the idea of that bank that I can go to. I told you that -- I was wrong on what I said about Minnesota. This is the population of Los Angeles, with the combined population of Alaska, Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Dakota, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Wyoming. Now, you are talking to the elected officials of all those states if we had them represented. But I don't have Minnesota in it.

Now, Dave Hayward, Member of the Southern California Rapid Transit District, an outstanding city councilman.

MR. HAYWARD: Mr. Vice President, Supervisor Hahn, Speaker Unruh, distinguished community leaders -- elected, appointed and selected. The question I have is that prior to and since the turn of the century, the Federal Government has provided maximum participation in meeting the needs of the people in the field of transportation such as railroads, shipping, and more recently, air travel, but only moderate emphasis on the transportation of

people within the cities. I would ask, what do you propose to do to assist us in meeting the existing, and the increasing demands for public rapid and total transportation systems within our crowded cities and urban community, a demand that extends beyond individual city or county boundaries and also extends beyond our local financial capabilities?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I was at a company here recently, a very fine professional company that has a number of subsidiaries, the TRW -- is that right, Jess?

As I understand, this particular company, with its experts, its talent, is doing the plans for the mass transit and rapid transit system for the Northeast Corridor. It is an interesting thing that the designs and plans for that rapid transit and mass transit system from Boston to Washington via Providence is being designed here in California and to be applied as a working operation in the Northeast Corridor of the United States, one of the large population centers.

I must confess to you that our efforts thus far in rapid transit and in public transportation have been very, very meager and not at all what I would consider to be productive and too helpful. They have been patchwork at best. We have provided some funds to see that people were able to get to work, for example, from a distressed area into where the jobs are. We have a mass transportation bill. We have the authority now in legislation to move ahead.

The fact of the matter is that many communities have never been able to agree on what they really wanted. I don't want to put the burden on you too much, but you know, straight talk does help. There have been battles over whether there ought to be subway systems, whether or not you ought to have more buses, what the rates ought to be, and then in between the large population centers whether you ought to have fast trains or there ought to be a monorail, or what ought to be. Then always the contest over availability of funds for the highway system as well as the rail system.

The Department of Transportation of our government is a new department. It has only been staffed within the last year and a half. I believe that we will be able to do much better with it, whoever is the next President of the United States, simply because it will have a base on which to operate.

I don't have much that I can tell you, except one other thing, that I have noticed that on weekends in some of our big cities, the public transportation system literally leaves large areas of a city without any form of transportation at all. We have geared our whole transportation system to the individual owner's car, the automobile, and of course, this means that billions of dollars go into our highway system. But of course, the automobile industry is one of our great industries, one of the largest employers, has a tremendous impact on our economy.

But I know of cities in which there are areas that people are not only locked in in terms of almost being in a ghetto, but even if they weren't locked in, they couldn't get out because there is no transportation.

Public transportation in the United States is one of the real weaknesses of our communication system and we are going to have to come to an understanding sooner or later as to just what kind of a transportation system we are going to have. Because it is not right that simply because you are of low income that you should be locked in because a bus schedule has been canceled out on Saturday and Sunday because it doesn't seem to make money. That happens in community after community.

Furthermore, because of the nature of American industry, a transportation system is vital to employment. Large numbers of workers are unemployed in America because of the inaccessibility to industry itself.

Now, we are going to have to tailor the institutions to the individual. I don't think there is any necessity of trying to revise the individual to the institution. Of course, one of the ways is to bring industry closer to the individuals and that is beginning to take hold. It is hopeful that industry will soon get the message that if they want a labor force, if they want one that is peaceful, if they want one that is responsible, they ought not to put it through the stress and the strain of an hour to an hour and a half to get to work and to get back from work, or they are apt to find themselves with portal-to-portal problems. That is not an impossibility.

Therefore, it soon will become quite evident, I would hope, to modern industry to locate where the people are rather than demanding that the people try to run half way across the county to get to where the job is. Bring the jobs to the people. If you can't do that, then you have got to provide a system of transportation that brings the people to the jobs and you can't have everybody do that by driving to work in a \$3500 automobile at a \$1.95 or \$2 job. It just doesn't work. We are going to have to learn how to build modern public transportation systems and operate them. Most of them will have to be operated on subsidy. Many of them, some people feel, will have to be operated municipally. I don't think that is necessity. But I don't believe there are many public transportation systems that can give full-time service without some local or federal subsidy, any more than you can operate rural free delivery into the rural areas of America without some kind of subsidy. This is just one of the simple facts of life.

Now, we are ultimately going to come to improving not only our transportation system on the highways but our airport system. I wonder how many realize the great neglect of our air transportation system that has taken place? We build highways in some areas -- I don't know what your cost is out here per mile, but I know that an interstate highway at a million and a half dollars a mile in the State of Ohio is characteristic. We spend more money in one state on an interstate highway system than we do on our entire airport system. Yet we are having more and more people go by air travel and we have greater safety problems everyday in air travel and more time is being lost. And time is wealth, particularly for educated people. Time is production, time is substance. And we waste more time getting to and from a job, more time getting to a plane and waiting on the plane to take off and to land, than most people live in other parts of the world. We waste more time in cars and plans than many people

live in total hours in other parts of the world.

So I believe that one of the crucial problems for the next president will be to try to find ways and means of working with state and local government to meet our air transportation needs, our public transportation needs, our mass transit needs, and our rapid transit needs. All of those are different. Every one is different.

Can I just leave you with one suggestion? There is always an outburst in public about the government in Washington getting too big. And it does get very big. I was a mayor of a city and I will tell you why I used to go to Washington. And I went there as often as I could get a ticket -- because I couldn't get anything at the legislature, at the state capital. Now, we are going to have to -- I don't know enough about the problems of the resources of this state; in fact, this is a more modern state than many. But I think it is fair to say that one of the reasons that the Federal Government has grown and grown and grown is because there has not been the coordination of activity and responsibility at the state level that there ought to be. The people live in the cities. They don't all live in the state house and they don't all live in Washington. Most of our people live in urban centers. Those mayors and councilmen, they have got to produce, and those county officials have got to produce. They are the people that are closest to the people. And if they can't get it out of the legislature or the Governor's office or the state department, they go down to Washington. I think it's about time that we began to understand that all three branches, all three levels of government have a commensurate responsibility, that if you are going to have housing programs, transit programs, communication programs, health programs, whatever it is, there has to be some kind of sharing of responsibility. I do think, however, in the days ahead that the Federal Government will have to share more of its revenues.

I meant to say this to Councilman Bradley earlier, that I believe we are going to come, once this war is over in Viet Nam, and I pray for that day to be this afternoon -- not later; it can't come too soon to suit me -- once that struggle is over, we will be able to enter into a federal revenue-sharing plan but with a formula that permits the pass through of those revenues to where they belong, down at the county and local level. But working with the states and that federal revenue sharing plan should give the states and localities wide flexibility of use. A categorical grant is restrictive, frequently is out of proportion. We have got to start to trust each other in our capacity and ability to use the funds. I know that somebody is going to misuse them, and I know that is going to make the news. But I would rather have somebody misuse the funds than never to have any funds at all to be used for what needs to be done as a constructive purpose. (Applause)

MR. HAHN: Now, Ken Nakaoka, the Mayor of Gardena. He is also the Chairman of the Japanese Chamber of Commerce of Southern California and a distinguished veteran. He fought for our country in World War II. He is a hero, he is a great civic leader, he is a president of the chamber of commerce, he has his own real estate agency. He will now present you a question. He represents a small city, Gardena, but it is the hub of this whole county. It is one of the finest cities in California.

MR. NAKAOKA: Thank you, Mr. Hahn. Mr. Vice President. It certainly is a privilege for me to share the podium here with our distinguished guest.

The question I had has been pretty well answered by the Vice President in his last two responses. However, with the many local government officials here, and this has also be partly answered, I would like to ask this question: I know that our National League of Cities and our United States Conference of Mayors annual meetings, we always come up with the question, will the Federal Government share with the local government some of the income we pay on our income taxes. I recall one specific item that read something like this: A \$10 per person return to the cities, to the local government. Mr. Vice President, would you share that sort of an idea? Could you feel \$10 per person -- if I said 10 percent, I was in error -- return to the local government. Would you share in those views?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: You may recall, Mayor Nakaoka, that the gentleman who suggested first the so-called revenue sharing concept was Dr. Walter Heller, who was the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Kennedy and then for a short period of time under President Johnson. I take some pleasure in saying that he is my economic adviser. He happens to be the Dean of the School of Economics at the University of Minnesota. I am happy to tell you that I introduced him to President Kennedy and he is the author of what we call the modern economics and the main spark and spirit behind this concept of revenue-sharing.

The formula -- I can't tell you what it will be. There has been this suggestion of a per capita type of sharing. The one thing that you have to keep in mind, it seems to me, is that some states have a much more heavy tax program than others and you would not want a federal revenue-sharing program to make it easier for some at the expense of others. Some states have income taxes, property taxes, excise taxes, severance taxes, sales taxes -- the whole business. Now, maybe that fits you. (Applause)

Then you go to another state that for all practical purposes has no income tax but depends upon sales tax and excise taxes and property taxes. Now, that state will come to the Federal Government and say, look, we have got to have federal help. But the other state that taxes itself more comes to the Federal Government and says, you can't give that state over there that doesn't have its income tax federal help until you have taken care of us when we have taxed all the way across the board. So the formula for revenue-sharing is a very complicated formula.

I don't know what it will be, Mr. Mayor. But I know that federal revenue-sharing is in the pattern of my thinking and my proposals. I don't know at this stage of a better formula than a per capita one because of its simplicity. It is pretty much the way that we have done on the basis of federal aid to education, as you know, the number of students -- the per capita, the average year enrollment.

We know that those formulas are generally pretty good. Then

we have built in what we call a compensatory factor, where the need is, based upon the extra need and the extra self-help that a state indulges in. A state that taxes itself heavily ought not to be penalized by a grant to a state that doesn't tax itself heavily. In other words, there ought to be some equalization factor. It seems to me.

I want to give you one other thought. I know the time is very short. I could be here with you all day. This is what I like to do more than anything else. I like to work with our government officials. (Applause)

I wonder how many of you know that on all of these meetings that I spoke to you about, the better than 40 that we have had this year, of those, in the last three years with local officials, over two-thirds of them were executive. We had no press, nobody in, we were just with ourselves.

Now, why? Because we had many things to talk out and nobody needed to make a speech and nobody was trying to get a headline. And we did do some things that have never been done before. My office has cleared, for your information, over 3,000 separate requests -- over 3,000 separate requests from municipalities and county governments and other local government units with the federal agencies. And they have been cleared successfully. In other words, 3,000 problems, 3,000 answered. Many more problems came to us, but we took 3,000 and were able to produce the results that the local government officials asked for, by cutting through what they called red tape. By going at it. If I become your President, I want you to know what my plan is. I am sure some of you are not going to vote for me and that may be that you have superior judgment. I can't tell.

My father used to say of my mother that she was a wonderful woman but she was politically unreliable and some of you may be that way. (Applause) But I think you ought to know what you would be getting. When I made the recommendation at the Democratic Convention of my vice presidential selection, I had in mind more than a man, more than a name. I had in mind what I had learned in my years, 16 years in the Senate, four years as mayor of a great city, and four years as Vice President working with our young people, working with our local government people, with our state legislatures. And I have learned a great deal. It takes some time, but I have learned.

And I said, I want to get a man that if I am elected, and the vice president automatically comes with you, that I can turn over to that Vice President the coordination of the domestic programs of this government, that he will be the super Cabinet officer. All other Cabinet officers are equal. They are all appointed by the President. But the Vice President is an elected official and by Act of Congress and by precedent, he is a Cabinet officer. He sits across the table in the Cabinet from the President. He occupies chair No. 2.

Now, Mr. Johnson, President Johnson, has given me a great opportunity. I have coordinated many of the programs for this government. I have tried. Some of them were not done as well as I would have liked. But I think we have learned.

Mr. Muskie, Senator Edward Muskie, is a former governor of a state for two terms. He is a former councilman. He is a former city attorney. He has been U. S. Senator for two terms. He is the author of the Intergovernmental Relations Commission. He serves on that commission, studying all the relationships between the different levels of government.

He is the author of the model cities program and handled that legislation in the Senate. He is an expert in the field of pollution control, water and air pollution.

I consider this man to be uniquely equipped by intellect, training, background and experience to be helpful in the urban crisis and he will become for you and for me Mr. American City. That is what he is going to be. He is going to be given by me as the President, if I am elected, delegated authority to cut through the bureaucracy and the red tape, to have an office that you can come to with a host of problems. Otherwise, you have to come to each office -- Transportation, Commerce, Labor, HUD, Health, Education, and Welfare, et cetera. He will be on the domestic side what the President is on national security.

The President is chairman of the National Security Council. I serve on it as one of the advisers. I will make my Vice President chairman of the Domestic Development Council, a domestic council in this country to bring these programs together so he can concentrate all of his talents and his attention and his office staff upon helping you. Because government in America is no better than it is at the local level. Most people are affected by government where they live. (Applause)

We need to have a partnership as never before. We don't need to scold each other. None of us are without some limitations. But we can learn from each other. It doesn't need to be partisan. I don't think we ever had a partisan comment in all of those meetings with local government, except in jest and fun. But we did learn a good deal from each other. I used to bring all the Cabinet members and put them there and keep them for a whole day and say, I want you to listen to these mayors, to these councilmen, these county councilmen and judges and so on. And they listened.

Because we have to bring together these front line agencies and local governments. You are the front line official. We are back in Washington. You are out here where people are worrying about building zones and traffic and smoke and water, communication, transportation, building, housing, crime and law and order. You are out here where the problems are. We are sitting back there being big shots and we are figuring out big programs. Well, those programs are not worth a hoot unless they work and we have got to make them work with you. (Applause)

I wouldn't leave you without telling you that every man that is in this room that is a mayor, every woman, has been put on the spot, so to speak, by his or her constituency by law and order. That is the big theme today in America. Well, there is a crime problem in America, a serious one, and it is not to be settled by slogans or bumper stickers or even speeches. I can tell you it is much more serious than that. There is a narcotics problem in this country, a serious drug addiction problem. There is an

organized crime problem in this country and there is what we call street crime. Actually, this last summer wasn't as hot as some people predicted. I hope no one is disappointed. I am not. But I remember the predictions of last April. You would have thought every city in America was going to be in flames. But it did not happen. Thank God, it did not happen. (Applause)

But I think every one of us know that violence does not settle a thing. Dissent, yes, disorder, no. That is my formula. The right to gripe, the right to be different, the right to dissent, the right to debate, the right to make it tough on us. But disorder, no. You cannot permit it and we cannot condone it and we are not going to and the next President is not going to. (Applause)

But I am not running for sheriff. I am running for President. I was the mayor in Minneapolis for two terms and I never expected my sheriff to run my police department. If I had insurrection in the state, I would have expected that under the Constitution, the President would help. But I am not one that believes in a national police force. We have enough federal power without that.

The police power rests in the state and the locality. Now, that is the simple constitutional fact. And let me tell you, don't let passion and emotion and momentary crises take that away from you, because federal power can become too much. Power corrupts. Absolute power corrupts absolutely. And you can't afford to have that concentration.

You know, I think the ultimate task of statesmanship is not the acquisition of power but the restraint in its use -- the restraint in its use. You have to have the power. You have to have the weapons, you have to have the military system, a military program. You have to have even in this crazy world of ours, where we have atom bombs. The question is not how to use them. The question is how do you restrain yourself from using them. That is particularly when you are Commander in Chief. Any fool can get this country into trouble. It takes a wise man to get it out. (Applause)

When we talk about law and order, we are talking about you and me and the councilman and the supervisor and the chief of police and the mayor and the city council and the governor and the prosecutor and chief attorneys and so forth. And law and order is like freedom itself. It is not cheap.

I want you to know that I am fully aware of your revenue limitations and when we were talking about federal sharing, one of the great needs and one of the things we must do next year is to fully fund, in fact, I think expand the authorization and fully fund what we call our safe streets and law enforcement act. We have got to be able to share more generously with the localities. You have got to be able to pay your police. The average police officer has a salary that is two-thirds a living wage across this country. We need better police, we need them better trained, we need more of it. We need modern equipment. We need universities and colleges setting up training programs. I have issued a paper on this. I am not a novice in this. I do not speak from theory. I speak from practice.

When I was mayor of my city, I called in my university, the University of Minnesota to set up the first training program for a police department. And the first thing we trained them in was human relations, believe it or not.

You and I know that law and order is a coin that has two sides to it -- order and justice. I want to make it clear that I think that law enforcement and law and order ought to apply to all communities, not just to some.

Let me specify what I mean here. I have talked to many of the leaders in the black community. And they would like equal protection of the laws, believe it or not. The people in the black community feel they are getting short changed frequently because of lack of adequate law protection. The poor are set upon more than any other by the criminal. There are more crimes committed in the areas of the poor on the poor than in any other area. And I have been a mayor of a city and I know when I came in what they used to say. If a police officer didn't do good, they said send him out on Fort Snelling Bridge. That meant that when a police officer didn't do too good, they put him out in an area where we needed good, competent police officers. We changed that. I put the best officers I had in the areas that needed police protection the most and the areas that needed police protection the most were not where I was living, not around the university. That wasn't where we needed it more. They needed some, but they needed it in North Minneapolis and other places where there were poor people and a higher crime rate.

We have to get down to business, instead of having law and order look as if it is an attack upon a race. Let's talk about equal protection of the laws. I happen to know by surveys that have been taken throughout this country that people in the areas of low income, white or black, are crying for law protection. They need it just like they need the best teachers, like they need the best recreation supervisor, just as they need the best doctors, just as they need the best playgrounds, all of which they don't get. These people need the best police officers we have got. (Applause)

Thank you. I am supposed to be on Channel 9, they tell me. I have got to go. But I feel so strongly about these things, I wanted you to know and I thank you for listening. (Applause)

- - -

CONCLUDING REMARKS
VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
PEPPERDINE COLLEGE
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
September 25, 1968

It's been almost twenty years since I was "His Honor, the Mayor." But after listening to you today -- to your understanding of problems ... your great wealth of ideas ... your commitment to action -- one gets that old tingle of enthusiasm which comes from running a city government.

If you people can use my talents in 1976, I'll be out here with you, starting in a new career at the level of government where the great problems of America will be found for the next decade or two. And -- who knows? -- I just might bring you a bit of experience in the kinds of work that government in Washington can do with our states and cities and counties. You say the word in 1976, and Hubert Humphrey will be on your team.

But for the next few years, I plan to work at the other end of the same problems. As Vice President, I have been the chief ambassador of our nation's cities and towns to the federal government. / And, as President, I shall not cease my efforts to bring new understanding to Washington of your problems, and new help from Washington to you. !

This cooperation between all levels of government -- including private industry -- is the surest way of solving those problems of our cities ... and our suburbs ... that have so far defied solution by any of us acting alone.

No one who knows these problems at first hand -- you and I -- denies that they are complex. Not one of us denies that we have to spend great amounts of time ... talent ... money ... and, if I may be partisan for just a minute ... no responsible person denies that we will have opposition from those who say "wait a minute," or "it can't be done," or "let's keep government out of these problems."

But I answer them: "Let's do it now... it can be done... and we are involved."

You and I know... when we work together on these problems... we will succeed beyond anyone's highest hopes and dreams.

Yes, we can launch a major effort to reduce crime in this country... to give effective support to our local police... federal aid for police salaries... for top class training... for modern communications equipment... for programs in community relations. And when I am President -- working with you -- this is going to be the first call on my time.

Yes, we can have modern, efficient transportation systems in this country. We have only just begun to apply the methods of our technology to have good transportation in our cities ... between cities and suburbs ... between home and the airport. This is a problem that binds the cities and the suburbs together in common interest. And it is a problem that, together, we are going to solve.

And, yes, we can attain our goal of decent housing -- homes -- for all Americans. This is another part of the problems of our cities.

We can have a Marshall Plan for our cities, bringing the resources of government and private industry to bear.

We can have a National Urban Homestead Act to subsidize the land costs for qualified private housing development to allow the use of relatively high priced urban and suburban land.

We can have an Urban Development Bank, to ease the burden on local sources of revenue and, yes, we can proceed directly to overcome the shrinking of the local tax base ... the rise in property taxes as needed services are increased ... through federal support for equilization of certain community services within entire states -- including education and welfare, for example -- where equal services will be provided within metropolitan areas, as well as between rural and urban areas.

Yes, we can do all these things ... and more:

We can complete the drive for real human rights in America for all our citizens ... to train unemployed men to hold jobs, and then provide them with productive, useful jobs at decent wages ... to make our cities places worth working and living in ... to provide the best standards in education the world has ever known, and ensure as much high quality education as a child can use from his fourth year through college ...

to bring the blessings of health to all our citizens ... and to give our older citizens -- your parents and mine -- more years of usefulness and a later life that is full and meaningful.

And I look beyond the cities ... and the suburbs ... to parklands, forests, lakes ... to the conservation of our great natural heritage, and its use for the recreation and benefit of all our people.

You and I can do these things ... because we will work together ... because we will experiment with new ideas ... new methods ... new forms of government. And because we will make them work.

This is what we can do together ... and, my friends, I say: "Let's do it now."

#

The Kerner Commission report on Civil Disorders is regarded by many as a landmark document dealing with the causes and suggestions for cures for the turmoil in our cities.

In what ways would you propose that the federal government implement the recommendations of the Kerner Commission?

Each Dept

TRW

Rapid Transit

City officials throughout the nation are alarmed about the crisis in our cities. They have called for a reordering of priorities in order to deal with the problems of the cities. As long as we are so heavily involved in Viet Nam, how can the federal government direct its resources toward the solution of our domestic problems.

Country
9 Billion
26.7 Billion

cities
9 Billion 1968
3 Billion 1960

✓ Revenue Sharing Spare Room
✓ Revenue Increase.

Marshall Plan -
no addition to current Budget!

Los Angeles County, with its 7,500,000
citizens is larger than 12 of our
states combined.

If it were a state it would rank
7th in size.

~~Revenue Sharing~~ ~~\$18 Billion~~

KEN NAKAOKA, Mayor of Gardena
Also President of Japanese Chamber
of Commerce of Southern California.

NEW Cities

Law and order
Equal Law and Order



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