



# news release

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE • PUBLIC AFFAIRS DIVISION • 2600 VIRGINIA AVE., N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20037 • 202/333-8750

Release for Friday AMs  
October 18, 1968

For Further Information:  
Ev Munsey, Ext. 201  
DC-661

## VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY SCORES NIXON ECONOMIC POLICY

Detroit, Mich., October 17 -- Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey today warned that the difference between his economic policy and Nixon's is the difference between 92 consecutive months of unprecedented prosperity and "three job-killing, profit-killing recessions in eight years."

Speaking to the Detroit Economic Club, Humphrey pointed out that during the Nixon-Republican years unemployment rose two million. But in the Kennedy-Johnson-Humphrey years unemployment has dropped two million, to the lowest it has been in 15 years, he said. He derided Nixon's proposal to fight inflation by creating more unemployment, calling a "cry of defeat in the battle against inflation especially when it is the forerunner of recession."

Charging that during the Nixon-Republican years, job training was completely neglected, Humphrey scored Nixon's promise to "take people off welfare rolls and put them on payrolls." How, asked Mr. Humphrey, does he plan to "put more people to work and have more unemployment at the same time?" He said that "not one single new Federal program was begun to train or retrain" the jobless during the Nixon-Republican years. "He had his chance to take people off welfare rolls and put them on payrolls," declared Humphrey, "and he did nothing about it."

Warning that another recession or depression such as we had during the 50's would cause a "social explosion" in this country, Humphrey said that a weak economy threatens our security both at home and abroad. He expressed confidence that Americans will vote for continued prosperity.

The text of Mr. Humphrey's speech is attached.

REMARKS

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY  
ECONOMIC CLUB, COBO HALL  
DETROIT, MICHIGAN  
OCTOBER 17, 1968

Tonight, we are together -- business ... labor ... and government.

We may disagree on details.

We may fight the good fight around the bargaining table.

But we do not disagree on what we are trying to achieve -- what is best for America and for all the American people.

We all recognize the great issues this year. First, there is Vietnam.

I have spoken to the Nation on that subject -- and about the arms race.

Last Saturday night, I spoke to all Americans in great detail about the problems of reducing crime and violence in America -- of achieving peace at home.

I have spoken out because I believe you have a right to know.

You need to know, too, what is going to happen to the American economy -- the engine that drives our entire system ... that produces the revenue ... the jobs ... the profits ... the unexcelled American standard of living ... in fact, the engine that makes everything else possible.

A healthy, expanding economy makes a great difference in our lives.

For most of us, it makes the difference on the one hand between rising incomes ... profits ... expanding industry ... and on the other, unsold automobiles ... sluggish inventories ... lower payrolls ... or no profits at all.

For some it means the difference between having a job and not having a job ... between keeping a family together and seeing it fall apart.

PAGE TWO

For others it means the difference between sending a youngster to college and wasting his potential for a lifetime.

For our cities, it can mean the difference between reprieve and disaster.

Now let me give you some straight talk about our economy.

First, the Republican record on the economy is not nearly as good as the Democratic record.

You know that the last time Mr. Nixon held public office, we had three job-killing, profit killing recessions in eight years.

During the 1960's, we have had steady economic growth -- 92 straight months.

We more than doubled corporate profits.

Dividends have gone up 66 per cent. And we have brought an increase in real income after taxes for the average family of four of \$3,000.

Yes, here in Detroit you know that difference is an increase in automobile sales of more than 40 per cent in the last eight years, and an increase in profits half again as much as that.

Let's look at the key question of employment.

At the end of Mr. Nixon's last term of office, in 1961, nearly seven per cent of all Americans who wanted to work didn't have jobs. In eight years, unemployment had gone up by two million.

Since then, unemployment has gone down by two million, and the Kennedy-Johnson Administrations have cut the unemployment rate in half, to the lowest level of unemployment in 15 years.

At the same time, we have added 10 million more jobs to the economy.

Mr. Nixon's chief economic adviser tells us that there should be more unemployment ... more people out of jobs as the answer to inflation.

I think creating unemployment is a cry of defeat in the battle against inflation -- especially when it is the forerunner of recession.

There is a better answer -- more humane and more efficient answer.

I have presented a detailed plan for ending inflation while having full employment and vigorous economic growth. This plan includes:

- A responsible monetary and fiscal policy;
- Improved match of labor skills to labor needs;
- New efforts to strengthen free competition;
- Stimulation of increased productivity and reduced costs through tax incentives and increases in investment;
- And a new, realistic policy on wage-price stability, to be worked out by labor and management together, and aided by a wage-price conference in the Executive Office of the President.

We can achieve reasonable price stability, just as we did from 1960 to 1965.

And we can do it without old-fashioned ... defeatist ... explosive ... costly ... increases in unemployment or sacrifices in economic growth.

What else does Mr. Nixon tell us about the economy?

He says he will take people off the welfare rolls and put them on payrolls -- something Democrats have been doing for years. But what has he done about it? -- Besides trying to make us believe he can put more people to work and have more unemployment at the same time?

PAGE FOUR

When Mr. Nixon last held public office, the Republican Administration grossly neglected job training.

Not one single new federal program was begun to train or retrain Americans to hold a job.

He had his chance to take people off welfare rolls and put them on payrolls, and he did nothing about it. And America paid the bill.

Now look at the Democratic record.

After eight years of the Kennedy-Johnson and Johnson-Humphrey Administrations, new programs that we started are in one single year training and retraining over one million Americans.

And they are training Americans to find jobs ... keep those jobs ... earn living wages for themselves and their families ... and pay taxes.

And you know this job re-training helps fight inflation by increasing labor mobility.

That is what we have done about the problem. And we're going to do much, much more -- until there is not a man or woman in this country who can't find work because he lacks the skills to do the job.

What about poverty?

I say that fighting poverty is just as much an economic necessity as it is a matter of social justice.

In the past eight years we have brought 12 million people up from poverty.

What does that mean?

It means that there are 12 million more Americans supporting their country ... not being supported by it ... buying cars ... taking part in the economic life of this Nation.

PAGE FIVE

The end of poverty means: Men and women with decent jobs at decent wages and no longer being a public charge.

What have Mr. Nixon and the Republicans done to bring people up from poverty ... to lead useful, productive, profitable lives and to support their country? Look at the record of the 1950's; no poverty or job-training programs.

And what does he propose?

He says that private industry should do something about finding jobs for those Americans who are out of work.

This is just another example of that old adage: When Mr. Nixon comes out with a good idea, someone else has already done something about it.

In the last nine months, the National Alliance of Businessmen -- a partnership of government and industry ... led by the top business leaders of America, including Henry Ford -- has obtained pledges from American industry to provide 310,000 new jobs for the hard-core unemployed and disadvantaged youngsters.

Nearly 190,000 of these out of work Americans have already been placed on the job, including more than 60,000 of the hard-core unemployed.

Think of it -- 190,000 people put to work in nine months ... with firm plans to find jobs for 500,000 Americans within three years.

Some of you sitting here tonight are taking part in this effort. It is you who deserve the gratitude of our Nation for doing something about this crucial problem facing our country.

You do it not because it is partisan ... but because it is right.

There is much more that we both can do -- not through platitudes on cooperation, but through the concrete plans that I have drawn up.

PAGE SIX

I mean plans like the Urban Development Bank, and my Marshall Plan for the cities.

Both of these plans need your help ... because they are hard-headed efforts to bring government and business together in partnership to solve the problems of our cities.

And there is one other idea that Mr. Nixon has advanced to help our economy. He wants to see more black capitalism.

Well, Mr. Nixon, so do I.

I want every American to have a chance to stand on his own two feet ... to run the risks of free enterprise ... to own his own business ... to make a profit if he can ... and to contribute to the strength of our economy.

There is only one difference: Mr. Nixon is talking about black capitalism, and we Democrats are doing something about it.

Since last June -- that's in the last four months -- the Small Business Administration, through Project Own, has doubled the number of loans to black Americans to start their own businesses ... and had increased the overall number of loans for anyone who wants to go into business by 12 per cent.

We did it with less Federal money than last year -- by getting private help.

Howard Samuels of SBA and I put this program together -- and I am going to see that it is extended from today's 26 target cities to every city in America.

As I've said, we don't talk -- we act.

And we are going to keep on acting ... and working ... until we help every American who wants to start his own business ... who has the talent and the will ... to do just that.

Finally, both you and I are concerned in America about two basic economic goals -- both stability and growth.

PAGE SEVEN

Whenever I talk to business and labor leaders, I see growing recognition of the importance of these two goals.

We must not accept inflation; we cannot tolerate stagnation; and we will not go down the primrose path to government direct controls on wages and prices.

Rather, we must travel a different highway.

The government must use fiscal and monetary policies to keep our growth steady and sustainable.

It must help to break bottlenecks and strengthen free markets.

It must review all its programs with price stability in mind.

It must improve productivity and efficiency through training and mobility of workers and stimulate more investment and modernization by business.

And it must work with business and labor toward greater wage-price stability.

I know I can work with both business and labor.

I believe that much more can be done with active business and labor participation in voluntary and cooperate efforts to fight inflation.

Before Americans choose their economic managers for the next four years, they should review the issues carefully.

In particular they will remember the problems they don't have today, as well as those they do.

The businessman will remember that profits bounced up and down during the Fifties, never rising for two successive years. He will remember that profits have increased on the average each year under the Democrats by more than in eight years combined of Republican Administrations.

The American worker will remember the era when he opened each paycheck with the dread that he might find a layoff notice in his envelope

PAGE EIGHT

The American consumer will recognize the income gains that have provided far greater purchasing power in recent years.

When American vote on prosperity, I am confident they will give us a clear call for more of it.

And I say we can get it.

And we will get it -- not just because we are interested in profits or dividends for their own sake.

We will get it because we know that the health of our American economy is the one thing on which everything else depends.

We know that -- with a recession or depression -- this country will be in more than economic trouble. It will be headed for social explosion.

We know that -- with a weak economy -- our security will be threatened and the festering problems of our cities will get that much worse.

But if we do what we know we can, we can take this country and build it so strong and free that nobody will be able to tear it down.

We will make our cities safe and liveable places once again.

We will do something about the transportation crisis in America. Getting there is not half the fun.

We will help make every American a tax-paying, productive citizen.

We will make the investments we know we must make in the education and health of our people.

And we will make this a better country for our children after all.

That's what you want.

That's what I want.

If you will put your trust in me, that's what we will have.

####

REMARKS OF  
VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY  
AT ECONOMIC CLUB, COBO HALL  
DETROIT, MICHIGAN

---  
Thursday, October 17, 1968  
---

Thank you very much. Thank you, Senator Phil Hart. Thank you again for what is always a kind and gentle and generous introduction.

I want to say to the people of the State of Michigan that you are indeed a very fortunate and blessed people. There isn't a finer man, finer character, quality, finer intellect, finer record in the Congress of the United States than your own Phil Hart.

(Applause)

I am very honored to see so many members of your Congressional delegation here tonight. They honor me by their presence as does your Mayor and, of course, it is always good to see one of America's most philanthropic, most civic minded, most devoted and patriotic citizens as Chairman of the Board of the Economic Club, your own Walker Sisler.

(Applause)

Since I will have something to say about you, Howard, a little later on, I will hold off but it is good to see you.

Tonight I want to talk with you about our country. I want to give you some of my thoughts about the economic life of this nation, what its prospects are, what maybe we can do together to assure a steady economic development of this great American enterprise system.

Tonight we are together, business, labor, government, people in voluntary organizations, education. We may very well disagree on some of the details of what I have to say and what you might have to say. We may fight the good fight around the bargaining table which is really the story of Detroit and I see my friend, Mr. Reuther, here, and he has been in a few of those bargaining scraps on occasion, but I do not think that we disagree on what we are trying to achieve, that is, what is best for our country and what is best for all of the people of this country.

Our argument is over means. Really it is not over ultimate aims or objectives.

I think we all recognize the great issues this year. First, there is the issue of war and peace, or as we would put it in more direct terms, of Vietnam, and of arms control.

Now, I have spoken on this issue to the best of my ability. I have lived with this problem through these four years of my Vice Presidency, and I have spoken out in some detail on the dangerous arms race that threatens the lives of every person on this planet.

Last Saturday night I spoke to all Americans in considerable detail about the problems of lawlessness, of crime and how to reduce crime and violence in America. In other words, of achieving peace here at home. I happen to believe that all of these problems are very difficult and complex. I do not believe that a single one of them is solved by a bumper sticker. I do not believe that there are any simplistic answers to the most delicate, sensitive, complex problems that a society has ever faced, and my only warning to you is beware, beware, Mr. Voter, of the simple answer.

I have spoken out. I don't say that what I have said you all -- you would agree with, but I have spoken out because I believe you have a right to know what I believe and what I think we might be able to do about some of our difficulties. I think many of you know that I look upon difficulties as challenges. I look upon problems many times as opportunities. I believe that others should speak out to you as well.

I have been privileged to bring together some 30 task forces of the most eminent men in America to study the issues that beset this Republic, in the field of foreign aid, arms control, after Vietnam, economic development, income maintenance, justice, order and justice, problems besetting our youth, the great tremendous challenges of education. Every one of these subject matters has been given thorough and reasoned study by the best minds that I have been able to attract to the subject matter.

I have asked that the respective candidates for the office of Presidency stand up side by side in the tradition of the Lincoln-Douglas debates, and that we speak to you as we do tonight, dividing our time equally, answering questions from the audience with equal time, being able to cross examine one

another in order to more openly clarify the issues or show the differences, but I have not been able to find the response that would make this possible.

Your Mayor suggested today that he would make available Cobo Hall for such a confrontation. I think it would be good for America. I do not believe that any --

-- (Applause)

-- I do not believe that anyone seeking the Presidency of the United States ought to ~~know~~ fear the challenge of debate or ~~ought~~ to avoid it. At least, that is my view of it.

Now, there are others that feel differently, but it is my view that particularly since none of us are incumbents, incumbent Presidents, and, therefore, we are not held with the same responsibility as an incumbent President, that we can speak to the people.

Now, you need to know also what is going to happen to the American economy as best that we can predict it or better yet, what government policy will be as it relates to the American economy because it is that economy that is the engine that drives our entire system, that produces the jobs, the profits, the revenues, the unexcelled American standard of living. In fact, it is that economy that makes everything else possible. And that is why it needs the most thorough and frank discussion.

A healthy expanding economy makes a great difference in our lives. For most of us it makes a difference on the one hand between rising income and profits, expanding industry, and on the other hand unsold automobiles and appliances, sluggish inventories, lower pay rolls, and oftentimes no profits at all.

For some others it means the difference between having a job, just a job, and not having a job, between keeping a family together or seeing it fall apart.

For others it means the difference between sending your boy or your girl to college or wasting their potential for a lifetime.

So, the income or the economy has something to do with personal lives as well as an economic system. What happens to production and profits, what happens to wages and prices has a great deal to do with what is going to happen in America and what is going to happen in America, my fellow Americans, has everything to do with what is going to happen in the world.

(Applause)

Now, just a word about our cities, a word about our cities. It is an amazing thing to me that we can have a campaign of such duration as this one and have had as little dialogue, as little discussion and debate, about the central problem of our time, the American city, with over 70 per cent of our people living in cities and with cities rotting from within. With cities plagued with problems of revenue, plagued with problems of race relations, plagued with a host of problems of transportation, pollution, crime, we haven't had an intelligent dialogue, debate or discussion on the American city of this campaign.

(Applause)

Ladies and gentlemen, we need it. I have tried to the best of my limited ability to outline what I thought was a proposal for the American city. I have never tried to tell you nor will I try to tell you tonight that any of these things that I suggest are cheap. Peace and freedom are not cheap, either.

(Applause)

Law and order is not cheap and as I pointed out just the other night, a crime bill of \$27 billion every year, \$27 billion every year, at a minimum, deserves more attention than it is getting today in terms of the expenditures or the investments that we are making in this country for law and order.

America is a great country and it cannot be saved and it cannot be improved by the kind of economic and social attitude that chokes its lifeline. We must have big thinkers and big people, people who plan and people who invest and people who dare. That is the way you built this city. That is the way that automobile industry was built. That is the way these great utilities grow. People that dare to dream, people that dare to plan, people that dare to invest. And yet, for some peculiar reason some people respond to a politician that tells you we ought not to do anything or that we should do less or that we should do no more.

There isn't a businessman in Detroit that will last a month if he says to his Board of Directors that he is not going to do anything more, and the Federal budget is as much a part of your business as your own capital stock. The Federal Government's budget, the state budget, the city budgets are so much a part of your business planning that you need to know what the man that is going to be in charge of that budget has on his mind and if he is going to go backward while you are trying to go forward, you are going to get stuck in a rut.

(Applause)

Let me just quickly say about our cities, we are going to make up our mind whether we are going to have confiscatory property taxes in cities, which is what is happening to the middle income man, or whether we are going to have Federal aid to our cities, Federal revenue sharing, so that our cities can survive. How much longer are you going to put the burden of all the social services of a city upon a home owner? You are not going to have home owners if you keep this up and the very people --

(Applause)

-- and the very people that say that they are for private enterprise and private property are the very ones who are today resisting the effort to use the most equitable tax form that we have called the income tax, the Federal income tax, as a way of alleviating some of the tremendous revenue and economic needs of our cities.

Well, let's take a look now at the record. Let's have some talk about the economy.

I am here as the Democratic standard bearer and I don't intend to pull any punches. I intend to lay it on the line as I see it.

(Applause)

The first thing I want to say is that Republican record on the economy is simply not nearly as good as the Democratic record. Now, that is a modest statement which can be verified by statistical fact. In the 1950's, which is the last experience we had of fiscal management and monetary management and business policies of the Republican Administration, we had three job killing, profit killing, job taking recessions in eight years. Three. And yet, we had the so-called peace dividends after the war in Korea, and not a single thing was done with those peace dividends to alleviate the problems which were then festering which have now exploded, not one single thing.

During the 1960's we have had steady economic growth for 92 straight months.

(Applause)

During the 1950's the wholesale price index went up 9.2 per cent. During the 1960's the wholesale price index has gone up 7.8 per cent. The wholesale price index has gone up less despite war, despite economic expansion. The consumer price index in the eight Republican years went up 12 per cent. The consumer price index in the 7-1/2 Democratic years or 7-3/4ths has gone up 16 per cent. Four per cent more. Why? Doctors, hospitals, nurses, school teachers, all get more money. Most of them were long overdue. Hospital workers, laundry workers, were at slave wages for all practical purposes, and when they were included, some of them, under minimum wage for the first time at that glorious figure of \$1.60 an hour, it raised the consumer price index. Services for your TV, for your automobile. But as far as the overall performance of the economy in terms of prices and price stability, there has been more price stability, Mr. Nixon, in the last eight Democratic years than there was in your eight Republican years and you got your price stability through three recessions that took their toll of \$175 billion of lost income through unemployment.

(Applause)

I have never understood why a Democrat shouldn't just be able to go into Wall Street and have them cheer him. It has never been -- all the people in America that we could say to you never had it so good was a crowd I talked to in Wall Street not long ago. There hasn't been one of them jump out of the window for eight years.

(Applause and laughter)

What is more, not a single Democratic leader has called them economic royalists. We have cussed them out. We have cursed them. We have abused them. Corporate profits have doubled after taxes, after price increases, have doubled in the last eight years. Now, what more do you want?

Now, I don't mind if you say you are Republican if it makes you feel better.

(Laughter)

But for goodness sakes, if you really love your stockholders and you believe in your business, why don't you take a look at the books? You have that obligation. Or somebody is apt to go tell the stockholders on you.

The fact of the matter is that corporate profits are doubled, investments are up, production is up, and there isn't any comparison between these eight years and the preceding. Dividends have gone up 66 per cent and there has been an increase in real income after taxes for the average family of four of \$3000.

Now, I say that is a pretty good record. Now, if you want to throw that kind of a record out, then if things go wrong, don't blame me, I am warning you.

(Applause)

Now, here in Michigan you know that difference is an increase in automobile sales of more than 40 per cent in the last eight years and an increase in net profits of half again that much.

I've got some figures here. That is one of the reasons I was a little late, Walker, getting over here. I wanted to find out a little bit about Michigan. Just a plain little old yellow sheet of paper here.

Let's just listen to this. Michigan was the only state in the entire United States where real per capita income dropped between 1953 and 1960. The record in the whole nation was bad enough, an increase of only nine per cent, but Michigan dropped five per cent. In contrast from 1961 through 1967, the real income in Michigan rose per person 34 per cent, an average of four per cent a year. This is even higher than the national figure which is 3.6 per cent a year. My, we Democrats have been so good to you in Michigan I think maybe I ought to leave right now.

(Laughter and applause)

Listen to this now. These are your own figures from your own state. The 1953 unemployment in Michigan was 13.8 per cent against a national figure of 6.8 per cent. One in seven of your labor force was jobless when the Democrats took over in 1961, one of ten was still unemployed. By 1968, unemployment was down to about four per cent. Non-agricultural jobs dropped 105,000, or four per cent, from 1953 to 1960. From 1960 to 1967 the number of persons on payrolls in Michigan increased 491,000 or 21 per cent.

(Applause)

Michigan did all right. and that is the way it ought to be.

I don't say this was all due to government. To the contrary. Government was just one of the factors. But Government is important, and there isn't a businessman in America today of any consequence that doesn't take a look at government tax policy, budget policy, monetary policy before he plans his expansion or his market development.

Now, let's take a look at the key question of employment. At the end of Mr. Nixon's last term of office in 1961, as I said, nearly seven per cent of all Americans who wanted to go to work couldn't find jobs. In those eight years unemployment went up two million. Since then unemployment has gone down by two million. And the Kennedy-Johnson Administrations have cut the unemployment rate in half to the lowest level of unemployment in the past six years.

(Applause)

But something else has happened. In the meantime, we have added ten million new workers, with good jobs, and Mr. Nixon's chief economic advisor tells us that there should be more unemployment, more people out of jobs, as the answer he said, to price stability.

Now, the Republican candidate is on record as saying that until the employment figure reaches 4-1/2 million, he doesn't consider it to be serious. Now, I am going to tell you, have you ever been one of the unemployed? It is serious. I have tried to run a business in a city, in a little community where there were unemployed. It is serious.

Now, it is all right for these statisticians to sit around there and figure that 4-1/2 million people unemployed isn't serious but if you are one of the 4-1/2 million unemployed it is not only serious, it is deadly serious.

(Applause)

But the fact of the matter is this isn't the answer to price stability. I don't think we ought to have to pay for price stability with three recessions in eight years.

(Applause)

It just doesn't make sense. And anybody that has gone through the first course in economics knows that you can't have to. You really don't have to be very sharp. You just plain have to have horse sense. What we need is an answer that is more humane and it is much more American in terms of its thrust, of its spirit.

Now, I presented as best I could some proposals for what I believe can bring us price stability, while having full employment and vigorous economic growth. My economic advisor is Mr. Walter Heller, who was the former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers and one of the great economists of this land, and it was his kind of economic advice that sent this country under John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson on the path to economic development and economic growth. The advice that my Republican colleague is getting is the same old advice that led this country into trouble year in and year out. I am telling you that when you get a doctor that keeps feeding you pills that knock you out, you ought to change doctors.

(Applause)

Now, the proposal that I outlined included a responsible monetary and fiscal policy. You cannot rely strictly on the Federal Reserve Board for the control over inflationary pressures. You have to blend monetary and fiscal policy. You have to have improved match of labor skills to labor needs. That means labor mobility. You need efforts to strengthen free competition so that there isn't price rigging. You need stimulation of increased productivity and reduced costs and tax incentives, and increases in investment.

Look what the Democratic Administration did. I read in the paper where Mr. Nixon says we are being taxed too much. He ought to know. It was his administration that had them on us. We have had three tax reductions since 1964 and only one modest ten per cent surtax and every single individual in this country today is paying less tax under a Democratic Administration than they paid under the last years of the Republican Administration. And that is a fact.

(Applause)

And it was the Democratic Administration, and I was one of them, that proposed letting business have corporate tax relief. Why? So that

American business could make the choices of the investment of its own capital, to rely upon the business community to create jobs, because jobs are not created out of make-work programs. That is the last thing, the employer of the last resort. Jobs are created out of this private economy. Six out of every seven jobs. And I advocated a year before the Congress passed the tax bill to reduce taxes. I was an advocate of tax reduction. And why? Because I thought it would stimulate the economy, because I thought it would bring in more and lower tax rates than high rates. If the same tax rates were being applied today that were applied in 1960 we would have \$17 billion more revenue on the present gross National Product. We wouldn't even have a deficit. But I would rather have a little deficit and a healthy economy than to have that kind of Republican medicine that gives you about a year and a half of prosperity and a half year of -- you get sort of a half a year down in the dumps where one time you have got to take a tranquillizer, the next time you have to take a pep pill and pretty soon you are hooked. That is about what happens.

(Applause and laughter)

I also proposed a new realistic policy on wage-price stability to be worked out by labor and management together. The first thing I intend to do is call in the leaders of labor and management, to have a good heart to heart talk with them about productivity, prices and wages and aid by a wage price conference in the Executive Office of the President. I think that we can achieve reasonable price stability just as we did from 1960 to 1965 and there was very good price stability from January 1961 through January -- up to January 1966. The only problem that set upon us was the extra expenditures starting in the fiscal year 1967 for the war in Vietnam, but we have had no price control and no wage control and yet we have had a half million men in the field.

It seems to me that we have demonstrated in Government that we know how to cooperate with the free economy and to keep it free and to trust the business and labor sectors of the economy to do their job through collective bargaining, through competition. I don't think there has ever been any better example of the kind of trust and faith and self-discipline in the economy than we witnessed here these past seven and a half years on the part of Government, business and labor.

(Applause)

Now, what does Mr. Nixon tell us about the economy? Well, he says he will take people off the welfare rolls and put them on payrolls. That is good. That is something that we Democrats have been doing now for years.

I want to say one thing for Mr. Nixon. He praised the President last night so much that he, I thought he was going to renominate him. That is a fact. I was at the Al Smith Dinner and I

couldn't help but think how nice it was that Mr. Nixon was with me at the Alfred Emanuel Smith dinner. I am going to go with him to a Hoover dinner one of these days.

(Laughter)

But he praised our President and I am pleased that he did. And now he says, very frankly, and I think he is right, that we must take people off the welfare rolls and get them on the payrolls. But I would like to ask him what has he ever done about it? He served in Congress. So did I. I was there when he was there. We both had a chance to make our recommendations. I can't recall one single piece of legislation that Mr. Nixon ever introduced that related to job training, that related to getting people off the welfare rolls on to payrolls. I can recall some legislation he introduced to cut down unemployment compensation or to prevent its increase.

But let's take a look. When Mr. Nixon last held office, the Republican Administration totally neglected a job training program and it had more unemployed workers by a factor of two million -- four million than we now have. Not a single Federal program was begun in order to train or retrain Americans to hold a job. Not one. I wonder when he got this new religion. I have heard about the new Nixon but when did he get this new spirit?

They had their chance to take people off the welfare rolls, and by the way, there were many more people on welfare rolls from 1952 to 1960 than there are now. There were more people that were poor by far. There were more schools working at half time than now. There were more cities that were bankrupt than now. There were lots more problems and they were in charge.

Let's take a look at the Democratic record. I picked up here a little story about the Negro in the American economy. Listen to this. The median income in America today is a little over \$8000. In 1962 only 13 per cent of the Negro families in America earned \$8000 a year, in 1962. Last year the percentage of Negroes at that income level had doubled to 27 per cent.

(Applause)

Outside of the south that number was 37 per cent of the Negro families that were earning \$8000 a year or more.

Fact number 2, let's look at the numbers in education. In 1960 only 36 per cent of all young Negro men had finished high school. The typical young Negro did not complete his junior year. Today he finishes high school and goes beyond. Today six out of ten, that is 60 per cent, finish high school, nearly double the 1960 rate, and the rate is climbing and climbing every day.

Fact number 3. Look at jobs. In 1960 there were 320,000 Negro and other non-whites employed in professional and technical jobs. Last year that number had doubled to 592,000 Negroes who were teachers, lawyers, doctors, clergymen and other highly trained skilled professional workers.

This is a record. Not as good as I would like, but a lot better than talk, a lot better than when other people were on the job and had their chance.

Fact number 4. What about poverty? Last year alone one million Negroes and other non-whites lifted themselves above the poverty line. This is the largest exodus from poverty that has ever been recorded in this country's history.

(Applause)

In the last two years more Negroes and other non-whites rose above poverty than in the previous six years combined.

(Applause)

So, we think that maybe some things have been happening. Not enough, but a good beginning. After eight years of the Kennedy-Johnson, Johnson-Humphrey Administrations, new programs that we started are in one single year training and retraining over one million workers, and during eight Republican years, not one worker was trained for or retrained under any federal program in cooperation

with American industry.

And they are training Americans to find jobs, these programs, and the jobs are being found and wages are being paid for themselves and their families and people are paying taxes. And you know this job retraining helps fight inflation by increasing labor mobility.

Now, that is what we have done about the problem.

Now, what about poverty? Well, I say that fighting poverty is just as much an economic necessity as it is a matter of social justice. It is only a very rich country that can afford to have poor, poor people. In the past eight years, in the past eight years, 12 million people have come up out of poverty into self-sustaining, self-respecting jobs. 12 million people who were welfare clients, unemployed, are today taxpayers, productive workers in jobs in the last eight years.

(Applause)

That means there are 12 million more Americans supporting their country and not being supported by it. That means there are 12 million Americans who are saying, ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country, and they are doing it.

(Applause)

Now, let's take a look at the economic record of the Republican Administration in the 1950's. No poverty at all. No job training program. And if you tell me there weren't any poor, then you were looking at a different America than I saw. And what does the Republican candidate propose? He says that private industry should do something about finding jobs for those Americans who are out of work. Well, it seems to me that when Mr. Nixon comes out with a good idea, and that is a good idea, someone else has already been doing something about it. He came out with a four point crime program about two weeks ago, three of which are already in operation.

(Laughter)

He came out with a six point anti-pollution program here last week and it is already in operation, every bit of it. Every single point of it. In fact, I am accusing him of plagiarism. He took my speech at Gannon College, Erie, Pennsylvania, made it into his task force report. We should be ashamed of himself.

(Laughter and applause)

In the last nine months of the National Alliance of Businessmen, a partnership of government and industry, and I have been working with it, led by the top business leaders of America including your own Henry Ford and Mr. Leo Beebe, his Executive Director, has obtained pledges from American industry to provide 310,000 new jobs with the hard core unemployed and the disadvantaged young people and I have been in charge for four years of the Youth Opportunity program for our young people. This year we obtained a 1,250,000 summer jobs for youngsters, disadvantaged youngsters.

(Applause)

Nearly 190,000 of these out of work Americans, hard core, have already been placed on the job. Think of it, 190,000 people put to work in nine months that were poverty stricken, hard core, depressed, frustrated, alienated, never had a job, and we have firm plans from private industry working with government to find five hundred thousand jobs for 500,000 Americans within three years. Now, this is an accomplishment.

(Applause)

Of course, there is much more that we can do, but not through latitudes, but through hard work and specifics. I mean plans like the Urban Development Bank for our cities where we will get private funds and government funds and put them into a development bank just like we do into the World Bank, just as we do for the Inter-American Development Bank, just as we have done for the Asian Development Bank, just as we have done for the African Development Bank. We can develop banks to redevelop the whole world. For some reason or another we get lockjaw when it comes around to having one to develop our own cities.

When I become your President we are going to have an Urban Development Bank with public and private capital so that cities can plan ahead and have the resources to start to rebuild the city and make it a liveable place.

(Applause)

What does my friend the Republican nominee say, and I quote him exactly? He says as the government strains to do more, the private sector is constrained to do less. Same old bundling.

Really, it just makes me kind of unhappy. I will tell you why, because it is not true. Look what you are doing here with the New Detroit Committee. Look what the Urban Coalition is doing in America headed up by John Gardner. Look what is going on in America through its churches and through the union welfare and pension funds all across this country.

What do you mean that the more the government does the less the private sector does? As a matter of fact, for the first time Government and business and labor and church and community are beginning to understand that they have to work together if we are going to build this country of ours and make it what it ought to be.

(Applause)

Now, there are other things. Mr. Nixon came up with another idea the other day. It is a good idea. I am mighty glad he saw what we were doing. He said he wants to see more black capitalism. I want to see more capitalism of all colors -- black, white -- I even like to see a little Red capitalism. I think it would do them some good.

Well, Mr. Nixon, I want to see it, too. I want to see every American have a chance to stand on his own feet.

(Applause)

And own some property, to run the risk of free enterprise. I don't think it is good enough to tell the black man that all he ought to have is a job. I think he ought to have the right to own. If I am one of those persons that believes that private property is good, and I think it is, then I think it is good for everybody.

I am one of those persons --

(Applause)

-- I remember what John Stuart Mill once said, great English political economist, he said let a man have nothing to do for his country and he shall have no love for it. And that is something that we can ponder. Let a man have a stake in his country and he will work for it. Let me have a dollar contribution from you and you will vote for me, I know.

(Laughter and applause)

Now, will the girls pass among the tables?

(Laughter)

Well, let's take a look here now at this program of black capitalism. There is only one difference between Mr. Nixon and myself. Mr. Nixon is talking about black capitalism or black entrepreneurship and we are doing something about it. Since last June, that is in the last four months, the Small Business Administration through a project known as Project OWN, O-W-N, has doubled the number of loans to black Americans to start their own businesses, and has increased the overall number of loans for anybody who wants to go into business by 12 per cent, and we did it with less Federal money than last year, by getting private capital to help. Howard Samuels is here tonight, this man sitting next to Walker Sisler. He is a businessman. He is a dynamo, a human dynamo, and Howard will tell you that he and I and a small cabinet committee put this program together. We spent hours and weeks and months working on this long before I ever dreamed about ever being in this position.

(Applause)

And it works. Howard Samuels has traveled this country over, 26 of the major target cities of America, to get this program underway and I saw some of it at work yesterday in St. Louis, the great super-

72

market, and I have a share, a \$10 share in that supermarket. And what I want the black man to have is some dividends, not only from his economic investment but I want him to have the dividends of a good education for his children, of a decent neighborhood in which to live, of a job for himself, of a day care center for his wife if she needs a job. I want the dividends of the shareholders of America for every American that is a shareholder in American citizenship and this federal union and I want those dividends to come to everybody.

(Applause)

Well, I have taken much of your time and I know that you have some questions and I am going to end up here now by asking you to keep in mind that during these campaigns, that sometimes it is rather difficult to sift out the wheat from the chaff, sift out the ideas from the noise. I can talk to you tonight about many aspects of our problems of our cities and our economy but I have given you enough of the feel of what I think so that you at least know my objective partisan position. And I am -- I do not say that we have done all that could be done. I say that we have done better than we have done before. I say that on these beginnings we must build.

I have had many people say to me, well, what would you do, Mr. Vice President? I would build on the experiences that we have had. Some of the things we have tried haven't worked. Some of the things that you try in business don't work. Some of the things they try in medicine don't work.

Now, if we were as unkind to our doctors as we are to our political leaders, there wouldn't be a medical profession because my goodness, look at the number of people that have died from heart transplants, but you don't go around saying you have got to stop it, drive them out of the country. It is time for a change, get rid of doctors that want that. You don't say that at all. You know what you say? You say to Dr. DeBakey or Dr. Lillihei, and by the way, I am happy to tell you most of those doctors were trained at the Hart Hospital at the University of Minnesota, to get a little domestic plug in, and I am happy to tell you that I was one of the original sponsors of the Hart Hospital when I was Mayor of the City of Minneapolis. We feel pretty good about that but we don't drive our doctors out. No, no. We say, look, they have made several attempts and one succeeded. Let's build on it. But what do we do in politics? What do we do in politics. Many of us in politics say fight the war on poverty. Cancer has killed more people and they call heart disease the great killer, but ladies and gentlemen, poverty has killed more people than all of those put together.

(Applause)

May I say that poverty is the cruelest killer of them all. You die by inches. You first kill the spirit, then you kill the mind, then you kill the body. At least there are some humane forms of killing, but not poverty. And what I am here to tell you is that there is a great economic reward if we are willing to go after it. The treasures of America are right here, acres of diamonds under our own feet. We have never even scratched the surface.

America is the great unfinished business of the world. We haven't come close to doing what we can do here and we have talent to be developed that will really be the greatest talent that this nation has known, and some of that talent is in the homes of the poorest of the poor. Some of that talent is to be found in the blackest of the black. Some of it is to be found in the whitest of the white. I don't know but it is there. And I say that the task of the next President is not to try to go around and count up all his due bills, it is not to go around and say, well, we have done enough, and it surely isn't his task to say we have gone too fast and too far, let's go back, because we have got a candidate like that, too, running around, you know.

(Laughter)

(Applause)

The task for the next President is to take an inventory of what we have done and what we have got and what we ought to do. I started taking inventory as a boy in my father's drug store at age 11 and I tell you there wasn't a year that we didn't find that there was some merchandise that just wasn't salable and we got rid of it, and the same thing is true of programs. Some programs don't work, get rid of them, but when you find one that does, build on it and when you find that job training produces jobs, build on it. When you find that Project Headstart helps children, build on it. When you find out that a job corps that can train young kids and make them into decent citizens works, build on it. And when I get to be President of the United States, which won't be long, I intend to build on it.

(Applause)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS  
ECONOMIC CLUB  
COBO HALL

SENATOR HART: Mr. Vice President, it is the custom of the Economic Club, and you indicated your awareness of it, that at the conclusion of our meetings, questions which have been sent forward be addressed to our guest. I see it is 9:30 o'clock. I report about 40 questions in hand.

Mr. President, I would suggest that we race in somewhat block fashion the three or four principal areas that have been identified by the individual questions as the areas of greatest interest, and then if time remains, and your patience, we will continue.

I may as a footnote invoke the right to put in an occasional throw-away question that has arrived which may wake up some of the fellows that may nod as we go through them.

The first area, and it is to the credit of the Economic Club that it is, involves the search for peace. And these are the way they run, Mr. Vice President.

"How does your plan for peace in Vietnam vary from the San Antonio formula?"

"In your opinion, will there be a truce in Vietnam before the election?"

"Could you comment on the Vietnam peace talks?"

"How important to Vice President Humphrey is the concept of saving face for the United States in Vietnam?"

"How would you define peace with honor? Everybody talks about what we should give. What should the enemy give?"

"Why ratify the nuclear nonproliferation treaty now?"

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I will take the last one first and I will come to the others quickly.

Why ratify the nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. I wish we could get words that everybody could understand. The Nonproliferation Treaty is, of course, nothing more than or less than a treaty that is defined, that has been negotiated that would hopefully stop the spread of nuclear weapons, the placement of the nuclear weapons in the hands of other countries, and would also stop the spread of the technology of the manufacturer or the preparation of nuclear weapons and their forms of delivery.

Why ratify it? Because several nations are now on what we call the threshold of being able to make their own nuclear weapons and they are anxious to do so. Every time another nation gets a nuclear weapon, the level of danger in this world is raised just that much more. We almost went to war, my dear friends, over the possession of nuclear weapons by Mr. Castro in Cuba. I want to remind you that the world situation has changed a great deal since then.

In 1962 and 1963 we were the uncontested masters of the sea with our Polaris submarines. And we had hundreds of Polaris missiles hidden below the waves of the sea. The Soviet Union knew that we had the power of total destruction and Mr. Khrushchev had to face up to that.

While we still have massive destructive power, and while we still have a superiority in missileery, and in nuclear power, I think I should tell you in all candor that now a nuclear exchange between ourselves and the Soviet Union would be catastrophic. The minimum dead in the first exchange would be 240 million.

Now, I know that there would still be people down in the silos. They could fire the second round or the third round of nuclear missiles, our Minuteman missiles, but for all practical purposes, society and civilization as we know it, would be destroyed.

Furthermore, radio active fallout falls in the northern hemisphere rather than the southern and, therefore, we would all be, because of the wind, all subject to radio activity.

Now, the Nonproliferation Treaty is what I consider to be the most important single step since World War II in building -- in one of the building blocks of peace. Why should we ratify it now? Because if you don't do it now, you are apt not to get it done at all. Delay. We didn't ratify the Versailles Treaty and America still has a sense of guilt because of that. We

refused to join the League of Nations. We helped win the war, refused to win the peace.

Now, the United States since the days of the Bruges plan of 1946 has been trying to stop the nuclear arms race. We created this weapon, this monster, and we wanted to put the genie back into the bottle. Since then five nations have become nuclear powers, all of which tells you that the world situation is very different. We need to put the cork in the bottle.

80 nations have signed that Nonproliferation Treaty now. The United States started it, we negotiated it, I helped negotiate it, I know a little bit about it. I have been the representative of this Government to three conferences in Geneva on nuclear testing and on nuclear weaponry and I was sent by your President and your Government a year ago April to six nations to help negotiate Article III of that treaty which was the inspection article, something to which I had given many years of attention.

This treaty is in our national interest. It doesn't in any way minimize our nuclear power. It doesn't minimize the Soviets, but it does provide a way and a means both for inspection and control over any possibility of spread of nuclear weapons or technology and I think it is mandatory, I think it is critically important that it be ratified, and this is one of the things that I have argued with Mr. Nixon about.

He says that

(Applause)

-- Mr. Nixon says that he is for the treaty but not now. Well, that is better than he was about the nuclear ban treaty. The nuclear test ban treaty he called a cruel hoax and catastrophic nonsense.

Listen, ladies and gentlemen, I don't think a man that thinks like that ought to be President. That is why I am running. I don't think he ought to be President.

(Applause)

Now, what about Vietnam? I outlined my position on Vietnam in Salt Lake City. I did it because every time that you say anything about Vietnam, if you leave out one word that you said the last week, somebody says you have changed your position. So, I decided it is like theology, you know. How many angels can dance on the head of a, point of a needle, and I just decided we would just put it down on paper and I put it down on paper, and I am not going to try to adlib it again because when I do, I regret to tell you somebody indicates it might have been just a little bit different because I forgot to say "and" and I said "but", or I forgot something else.

(Applause)

Now, what I put down on paper was that our platform says that there are certain acceptable risks, for peace and that you must be willing to take certain risks for peace just as you have to take risks in the battlefield. We have taken risks in the past that walked within a few miles of Soviet ships and a few yards of Soviet ships in Haiphong, and I will never forget one time when the President was making one of those decisions he said, when some of the military wanted him to bomb the harbor, and there are always Senators that wanted to bomb the harbor. We have got to real bombsey ones around there, got a couple of them running for office, and they wanted to bomb Haiphong and I will never forget the President saying one day, he said, if I were to order that, why, it would just be my luck that the pilot that was in that bomber would be a Texan from Johnson City and would drop it right down the smokestack of a Soviet freighter.

And then what did you have, a lot of people all filled with ideas somehow to shorten this war, some of them through massive escalation.

I said we ought to take some acceptable risks, and in that I said that one of those acceptable risks would be the cessation of the bombing taking into consideration, of course, first I said the protection of our troops. I pointed out that if you could shorten the war that would be the best way of protecting our troops. I said, however, before taking that step, I would look for evidence by word or deed, direct or indirect, that the Communists would restore the demilitarized zone, and why? Because that demilitarized zone is the easiest thing for them to restore. It

is an international zone. It never was supposed to be violated. It doesn't belong to them and it doesn't belong to South Vietnam.

I believe that that is a reasonable approach. I am not going to say more because there are very sensitive matters underway right now and no man wants to jeopardize those negotiations. I stated my case.

Now, let me also add that I believe that the next President of the United States, if he does not find -- if this President does not find peace, must have it as his objective to find a way to bring this war to an end and to bring these resources of men and material back to where they are desperately needed in this country. But I also must say to you that the word honorable is not too difficult to define. The word honorable simply means that we will not sell out the security or the safety of the peoples of South Vietnam, that we will not permit military force from Hanoi to dictate a government in the south any more than we will have pressures from Washington to dictate to political institutions in the south. That is what honorable means, and I have a feeling that such a peace can be obtained and I am going to pray tonight as I hope that you pray, and I say this in all reference, that efforts that are underway right now may lend themselves towards what we have hoped for and prayed for and pleaded for for months, namely, a negotiated political settlement. I hope and pray that that will be possible. (Applause)

SENATOR HART: Mr. Vice President, the second in total number of individual inquiries relates to the matter of debate. It ranges from what I suspect is a rather partisan member of the audience, "Why won't NIXON debate", to "during the campaign in 1964 you opposed TV debates. What are your reasons for favoring TV debates in the election year 1968?"

"A number of other questions, one of which is, "

"Would you accept the offer made by the Mayor of Detroit to debate the other two candidates herein Cobo Hall tonight or some day soon"? Variations on it but that is number 2 on the Hit Parade.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: First of all, I do accept the invitation I said so today. I thought it was a very generous invitation and this would be an ideal place for such a confrontation.

(Applause)

The questions are very legitimate, very fair. In 1964 the President of the United States, the incumbent President of the United States, not a candidate but the incumbent President, did not want to debate Mr. Goldwater apparently. I was the Majority Whip of the United States Senate and as the Majority Whip of the United States Senate I tried to carry out for the purposes of party discipline and party regularity, which is the way you run a Congress, the request of the President on the matter of suspension of Section 315 of the Federal Communications Act. The President did not -- that was his judgment.

Now, he did not want a debate with Mr. Goldwater. He was the incumbent President and it is a very different thing to be an incumbent President and just a candidate. And he asked us to try to -- asked us to table the motion, to table the motion, which means to kill it. That was requested for the suspension of Section 315. I voted that way.

Now, many people have been going around the country saying, well, Hubert Humphrey, you have got to be your own man. Well I want you to know I am. I want a debate. I don't care whether Johnson wanted it or not. I do.

(Applause)

I think President Johnson had his reasons. I have mine. I am not the incumbent President. I am not Commander-in-Chief. I have got a seal out here. I have got one little olive branch, that is all.

(Laughter)

You give me a whole cluster of them and I will do something about peace.

(Applause)

I only got one little arrow, too. The Presidential seal has got a whole sheathful of arrows. I thought you would like to know what I plan on doing with that arrow.

(Laughter)

Nixon is the one.

(Laughter and applause)

SENATOR HART: The third most frequently mentioned subject is difficult to label. Law and order, I suppose is the best way to shorthand it.

"Mr. Vice President, you are reported as saying let's turn on those who think we are going too fast. There is no excuse for police standing idle, while there is looting. The question, what is too fast and what should the police do?"

"How does your position on law and order differ from the meaning implied by Wallace when he talked about law and order?"

"With regard to law and order, I understand that your position is that there can be no law and order without first having law and justice. Would you not agree, then, that law and order are only forerunners to law and justice?"

"Was the Federal Government playing any significant part in the inciting to riots? We have heard how Government agents have worked with Students for a Democratic Society, black power violence. Are these rumors completely unbased?"

Several others to this point.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, I must say these are very thoughtful questions and I shall try to give you as thoughtful an answer as I can. I would like to know, just to see whether I am spending my money in the right way or the wrong way, how many of you people here did hear my broadcast last Saturday night on law and order. Would you raise your hand. I thought it ought to be replayed.

I hope that anybody here, my campaign group will take note of that. Oh, you know, we fool ourselves, we people in public life. We go around thinking that people listen to what we say.

I want you to listen to it. I am going to raise the money to put my broadcast here in Detroit, 30 minute broadcast.

(Applause)

The head of my task force on law and order or law and justice was Dr. James Wilson of Harvard University. I had some 30 to 35 of the top specialists of this nation, - from police departments, people in the field of criminal law, people that are experts in our penal institutions, sociologists, people from the Armed Services and elsewhere, that joined together into a working task force to provide me guidance on some of the matters relating to what we call law enforcement, or as I call it, civil order and civil justice. I will try to give you a cogent answer, a coherent one as well.

My Republican opponent indicated some time ago that those of us that thought there was a relationship between poverty and lawlessness were misinformed. I think I am being fair about this and if I am not I shall apologize to him. But I recall that he said that in certain parts of Ireland there was great poverty and there wasn't very much lawlessness.

I think that maybe true. I think there are always exceptions to the rule. But I do think it is fair to say, at least this has been my observation from my study, that the highest rate of crime is in the areas of the poor, that the poor commit more crime than any other group and they commit more crime against each other than any other group and they commit it in the area in which they live. White or black.

I think that this indicates that there is some relationship to deprivation and lawlessness, not a total relationship, not at all, but it is a factor. It is one of the influencing factors.

Now, what did I propose on the issues? There is organized crime, there is street crime, and there is juvenile crime and there is violence, what we call rioting and looting. There are about four areas.

On organized crime, my Republican opponent takes great delight in denouncing the present Attorney General. He also has a few unkind things to say about the courts. Now, the fact is that this last year -- during the last year of the Republican Administration only 19 cases of organized crime were prosecuted. This last year, over 1300 cases against organized crime were prosecuted.

(Applause)

I just want to tell my Republican opponent that if he is going to debate me he had better get up to date on his figures because I am

ready to go.

Now, let's take a look at something else. The average Police Department in the United States or the police departments are understaffed, underpaid, undertrained, poorly equipped. Most cities cannot spend much more money to train, equip or hire additional personnel.

In the District of Columbia there were several hundred vacancies in our authorized Police strength. No one would fill them. You couldn't get anybody to fill them until we increased the salaries, and when the salaries were increased, which the Congress did, every vacancy was filled.

We have a chance from some of our men that are coming back from the Armed Forces today to get some of the finest trained manpower that this nation has ever known, but why in the name of common sense should they be taking on the toughest job in the world and it is-- they are the frontline of our defense. They are accused of everything. They are harassed. They have got to make on the spot judgments. They have got to settle everything from drunken brawls to battles between husbands and wives and drunken drivers, rebellious kids, and you want to pay them two-thirds of a living wage, two-thirds of a living wage, and that is about what they get in most big cities, and you are not going to get the kind of personnel that you ought to have.

Now, Mr. Wallace was asked the other day what he meant by support for law and order, what he thought a President could do. He said he thought he could give moral support.

Now, the police power in this country in the main, and with the tradition and under the standards of our Constitutional system, rests in the state and in the local government. We do not want a national police force. We have got plenty of power in the Federal Government without having a national police patrol running across this country. We ought to leave this, like education, at the local level.

(Applause)

If you agree with that, and there are those that don't, but if you do, and I do, then what should the role of the Federal Government be? The role should be that of generous and effective grant of funds and technical assistance and equipment to the local police and state police authorities.

Now, what do I mean? Let me just give you an example. The Army in Vietnam today has censor devices that can detect the movement of personnel miles away. Why can't that be used by our police? A walkie talkie. An officer today has to carry one around. That leaves one hand totally immobilized. He can have it on his belt. We have miniaturized walkie talkies so he can communicate instantly with a fellow police patrolman and in a wave length instantly to a precinct or central station.

There are all kind of new equipment that can be made available but it is costly. Every Police Department needs it and every mayor of every city needs additional funds to hire more officers and to pay them more and when you pay them more, you professionalize them. You can have higher standards of recruitment.

We need our universities and our training institutes to have programs that relate to law enforcement. We ought to have scholarships for officers who want to go on and specialize in certain types of law enforcement. Obviously, we need training programs. In the State of New Jersey since the riots in Newark they have what they call Operation Combine where the state patrol, the sheriff's office, the local police and the National Guard train together for weeks, not only on riot control but on human relations, community relations, what the policemen's rights are as well as what the citizens' rights are.

Now, we get a lot of people today saying that the courts make it so difficult. The reason why? Because the police officer is not trained to know what his rights are and he isn't trained to know what your rights are. After all, we don't want a police state. After all, a policeman ought to know what a citizen's rights are. And the only way that you are going to find that kind of police officer is to recruit them.

Now, we have upgraded the quality of our teachers, we have upgraded the quality of our public health officers, we have upgraded the quality of our social workers, we have upgraded the quality of

our librarians. Now, there isn't a one of those that has a greater and more important job to do than your police officer.

You need police protection in the areas of the ghetto. Remember that the Negro community, the black community, is asking for help. They have a right to equal protection of the law. And what some people mean by law and order is black and white. That is what they mean. And you and I know it.

Now, when I talk about law and order I am talking about improving police departments. I had to run one once. I was the mayor of a great city. I had to pick the Chief of Police. I had to be responsible for the budget and I patrolled the streets and I went to the precinct stations. I improved and increased, in fact doubled the patrolman's salary and I sent my police officers to the Center for Continuation Study at the University of Minnesota to study race relations because my city had a bad reputation for being anti-semitic. And I made up my mind that we were going to have human relations if we had nothing else in Minneapolis.

Now, it can be done but you can't do it on the cheap. We have got a Safe Streets Act that we put \$62 million in, \$62 million. We spend more than that on the firefly. You spend more than that on the boll weevil. \$62 million for the protection of all of the American people.

Well, I was specific the other night. I said If I am your President I will recommend that it will be increased ten-fold, and Jerry Cavanaugh in Detroit will get some of it right out here so that you can have some for your police.

(Applause)

And what else do we mean? We mean training institutes, in-service training. We mean professionalization.

Mr. Nixon said we ought to have a central information service. We have had it for two and a half years. Then, he said that we also ought to have a national academy for training them. We have got one in Quantico called the FBI Academy. And he had one other suggestion. What was that other one he had that we already have? Oh, that we ought to have a special office in the Attorney's office. We have got it. Then, he had a fourth one. He said we ought to have sort of meetings, town meetings, about crime. I thought that smacked a little bit of vigilantes.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, we don't need any more meetings about crime. We can fill up this room with reports on crime. We have had crime reports until they are running out of our ears. What we need to understand is that the local governments are incapable today of being able to properly man the forces that are necessary for the improvement of law enforcement. And what else do we need? Once you pay an officer enough you demand that he be a disciplined officer. If you pay him to be a professional, he acts like a professional. You usually have a highly mobile National Guard unit that can be brought in at any time in riots, trained, disciplined, just like the troops. We ought not to have to bring Federal troops on in. We ought to be able to handle this with our local people and our riot -- and our National Guard on riots, but if I am President, and there is a need for troops, I want you to be clear about this. I learned one thing, that prompt action is essential. Large numbers of manpower and prompt action.

(Applause)

Now, what about this business of justice? Well, that just comes with it. I want people -- we are talking about law and order -- to remember that there are building codes, too. There are sanitary codes, too. There are housing codes, too. And when I was the mayor of my city I tell you what I did once, Jerry, and it is a hard one to do and I didn't get by with it very good, and Listen, I bleed for every mayor of any city. That is the most difficult job in the world, it really is, and I have worked with them as this mayor knows. I have been to 50 cities, I have been to more cities in America than all the other candidates combined and I met with the mayors about their problems and there isn't a one that I know, Republican or Democrat, that doesn't want to try to do a good job. He would like to do a good job but I will tell you this. One of the things you are going to have to have, you are going to have ways and means of enforcing all the laws. You cannot expect people to live in utter misery over a long

extended period of time and be happy about it. Dr. Conant said that there was social dynamite in our cities and he said that ten years ago and it has begun to explode. And we don't like it. And we can't have it. We can't afford to burn ourselves down and burn ourselves up in the name of trying to improve things. Violence is not the answer but because violence is not the answer, then may I say neither is apathy or indifference and if you are going to tolerate violence, which I will not tolerate, I am not going to tolerate apathy and indifference. We are going to have to be as militant in correcting the inequities as we are militant and as we are strong in enforcing the law. And that is the kind of President I am going to be.

(Applause)

SENATOR HART: Well, the fourth, Mr. President -- we have the area of peace, of the debate, of law and order, and now in total of the 40 odd that are in now are items that would be labeled highly political. And I grab five of about nine. This isn't highly political. Actually, this is a very thoughtful one.

"Has the importance of the office of Vice President changed in recent years, and if so, what impact, if any, do the changes have upon this present campaign?"

"What about" -- this is a natural following that -- "What bait did you use to catch your Muskie?"

(Laughter)

"What do you understand to be the difference between Nixon and Wallace?"

"Would you be willing to appoint some Republicans to your Cabinet?"

"How do you plan" -- well, this is a wretched one on which to leave you, but knowing you, you would not want me to put it in my pocket -- "How do you plan to win this election when you reportedly are so far behind?"

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I am going to leave that last one there for a while because I might, well, I want you to go out of here in a happy spirit, all you Republicans.

(Laughter)

You know, one nice thing about meetings like this is we can look at each other and be civilized and friendly. Last night I was with Mr. Nixon in New York. We really treated each other rather nicely and I suppose that is the way it will be from here on out. I have never been very personal, never had any personal hates or -- I don't think I have ever hated anybody, as a matter of fact, and I surely never have my political opponents. Most of them I find rather interesting people. Sometimes they have been too interesting.

But let me take question number 1, "Would you be willing to appoint some Republicans to your Cabinet?" Indeed, I would. Indeed, I would. As a matter of fact, I have a feeling that in order to govern this country, in light of some of its very difficult and some of the very difficult situations that we now face, that it might be very desirable to have some good Republicans in the Cabinet and I am talking about Republicans that are living in the last third of the 20th Century and that are forward looking, and I would look forward to that, and I hope that I will have the good fortune of being able to have that cooperation. That is number 1.

(Applause)

The question is, "Has the importance of the Office of the Vice President changed in recent years and what impact has any change had on the present campaign?"

Yes, it has. When President Truman became President, he has told us, told me that he had no idea at all of some of the things that the President, President Roosevelt was doing at the time or that he had in mind, and surely he had very little information about some of the highest matters of national security.

I think I should tell this audience that every morning I get exactly the same briefing from the intelligence sources of our government, and that is the best that we are able to provide -- some people don't think they are very good but they represent the best that we are able to get. There are two booklets made available, booklet number 1 for the President and booklet number 2. They are delivered to my home when I am in Washington at 7:00 a.m. under guard and if I want them while I am away, they are brought to my attention through either guard or through a closed circuit.

It makes you think twice before you say some things and sometimes when you say some things you wish to goodness you hadn't. Very difficult assignment. It has made it a little more difficult sometimes to campaign because I do feel a sense of, a very keen sense of responsibility, particularly when I am asked questions about NATO, Vietnam, our national security. It may be that I have some information that you don't and I just pray to God that I don't let some of it slip. Sometimes I wish I didn't even know what I

do know about it.

How about the importance of the office? It has grown ever since the days of Henry Wallace. During World War II President Roosevelt made Henry Wallace, you may recall, the Director of the Economic Mobilization Board, I believe it was, and he used Henry Wallace to travel a great deal for him, to contact heads of state. Since that time, with Mr. Barkley, and under Mr. Truman and Mr. Nixon under Mr. Eisenhower, and then Vice President Johnson under President Kennedy and myself under President Johnson, I think this office has grown.

Let me give you a little idea of some of my responsibilities. By the way, a Vice President has very little authority. The only authority he has is to cast a tie vote, a vote where there is a tie in the United States Senate. That is the only authority that he has. But here is his responsibilities. He is a member of the Cabinet. He is a member of the National Security Council, the highest Council in this Government on matters of national security.

Now, we don't take votes there. It is advisory to the President. So is the Cabinet advisory to the President. You remember Abraham Lincoln once said the vote is eight yeas and one nay, the nays have it. I mean, the President makes a decision. I have people say some manytimes didn't you vote on such and such a thing in the Security Council and I say no, we didn't vote. The President will ask for our point of view. The President will ask all the people that are in the security Council and then after he is all through asking he goes off by himself some place and makes his decision.

That is the way a President must do. You don't go around trying to take a public opinion poll, put your finger up and see what the count is. You listen and talk to people outside the office as well as in inside.

I am Chairman of the Space Council. I have the job of trying to coordinate the space programs including such operations as Apollo 7, including such operations as some of our efforts that we are making in a very sensitive reconnaissance satellite. I have the responsibility to be Chairman of the National Science Council, our development in oceanography. I started this. This came out under statutory law and I am the first man who was the Chairman of that Council.

I am the Chairman of the President's Youth Opportunities Council. We had 50 target cities this year. We worked with the Mayor here in this city on jobs and recreation and education and it took a lot of my time.

I am Chairman of the Advisory Council of the Peace Corps. I am also Chairman of the Economic Opportunity Council that helps coordinate many of the poverty programs. I serve as the Chairman of the President's Council on Natural Beauty and Recreation and Conservation. I guess I have a few other responsibilities by statute. Yes, I am a member of the Smithsonian Board of Regents. Finally, I made it.

(Laughter)

All of this is part of the development.

I have been the President's liaison with local governments, all the local government officials all across this land, city managers, mayors, council men and legislators. And we have had over 50 meetings and none of them have been publicized. All of them have been executive so that we could really do the job that needed to be done. The Vice Presidential office has grown.

But, now let me tell you what I am going to do. You said what bait did I use -- how was that -- did I use "to catch Muskie". I want you to know something, and Phil, I think knows it, because he is a very personal friend of Ed Muskie. He knows that I had Ed Muskie in mind for a long, long time if I did get this nomination. I never told Ed Muskie and I never told Phil Hart, but I think they had some sort of a feel about it. I have admired Senator Muskie. I thought I needed somebody that was a balance to me. I thought I needed a man that had extraordinary knowledge of local government, that had an appreciation of the problems of the cities. Ed Muskie is the author of the Model Cities legislation. He is a member of the Intergovernmental Advisory Commission. He was one of its authors. He is an expert in water pollution and air pollution control. He is a former governor of two terms. He is a Senator of two terms. He is a Phi Beta Kappa. He is a lawyer. He is a man of judicial temperament. He is an advisor. HE is a counselor. He is not a yes man. When he and I sat down and talked about the Vice Presidency, I said I want you to know something, I don't expect you to always just do as I say. I want you to talk to me, I want you to be my adviser, I want you to be my friend. I want you to tell me when I am wrong. I prefer that you do it privately but if that isn't satisfactory, you can do it the other way but let's have a team.

And I want you to know from this platform that when I am elected President I intend to use Ed Muskie, Senator Muskie, then Vice President Muskie, as a super Cabinet officer. I am going to ask him to take control of and manage and coordinate these domestic programs that relate to our cities so we get some sense out of these departments, so that we filter out some of them that don't work and bring in others that do.

He has studied now for eighty years the grants-in-aid programs that go to every city. No man in America knows as much about the grants-in-aid programs to states and cities as Senator Muskie. I picked the right man to coordinate and I picked the man --

(Applause)

-- I picked the man that you can have confidence in and I want to close off on this note. I hate to say it but you have got to talk about it and I had somebody say to me one other night here, kind of scolded me about it. I always don't get scolded from my more intimate advisors. And I sass them back, too. But they don't say what I am about to say now. It doesn't sound right.

Well, maybe it doesn't sound right but it is the truth. And that is kind of refreshing to hear once in a while. One out of every three of the Presidents in the last 50 years has not lived out his term. He has either been assassinated or died of natural causes. One out of three.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, that means you ought to be concerned about who is going to be Vice President. I want to tell you that if I am going to be the President I want to know that I have somebody sitting alongside of me that -- (rest of sentence inaudible because of applause)

Without reflecting on the character of others, because they are men of good character, I know these other men and I do not want to reflect on their personalities. I have worked with General LeMay when he was head of the Air Force. I know Governor Agnew, know him and like him, but I honestly believe that you have every reason to feel a little safer and every reason to feel just a little better in the knowledge that if the Democratic Party wins, that a man like Muskie is my Vice President. I think you are better off. And let me tell you --

(Applause)

s-- I think if you will just put it this way, think of these terms. How would you feel with President LeMay or President Agnew as compared to President Muskie?

(Applause)

I want to thank you all. We can stay here and answer a lot more questions. You are the most patient audience in the world and no one likes to do this more than I do. May I say to my Republican friends here tonight I thank you for listening to me and may I -- oh, he wanted to know how we are going to win. I forgot. I just sort of took it for granted.

(Laughter)

I will tell you, I am very open about this. There is no doubt that we have been far behind, no doubt that we got a late start. I don't want to give you our tale of woe but may I say that most campaigns are ready to take off on Labor Day and our convention was hardly over by Labor Day.

We have plenty of problems. We have tried to put back together a party but we are on the move and we have put that party back together and people have seen the alternatives and they are beginning to exercise the kind of judgment that mature citizens should exercise.

We are going to win this campaign. I believe we are or I couldn't keep on, I can tell you that. I am working as hard as my body can take it and I can go but I believe that we will win this campaign because I think we have now what we call momentum. I think the others have peaked out and I know that we are on the upward trend. I know that there will be statistical information come out called polls very shortly that show that we made a rather spectacular gain in these last few days and I think we have been making more gains but I will tell you how we are going to really win. We are going to win if you believe. I think the central question in this campaign is -- of these issues alone, there is one question above all in this campaign. Which of these men, what one of these men do you think you can trust? Which one do you think you can best put your trust in to manage this country? And secondly, is which one of these men that seeks to be President do you think can help make trust among each other because, my dear friends, unless we can trust each other in this country and grow to trust each other, unless we can look at each other as neighbors and friends rather than enemies and foreigners, unless we can have a sense of community and really a sense of fellowship in this country in which we can have trust in one another, and unless you can trust your President, there isn't any hope. And I hope that I can engender in you the feeling that at least while I may not know every issue and not have every bit of information at

my fingertips, I hope that you will believe that in my heart I want to do the right thing and that you can trust me, and if you can trust me, I think we will win this election. If you don't, I can't.

(Applause)

# # #

REMARKS

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

ECONOMIC CLUB - COBO HALL

DETROIT, MICHIGAN

OCTOBER 17, 1968

*Mully Horton  
maker Salish*

↳ Tonight, we are together -- business ... labor ... and government.

↳ We may disagree on details.

We may fight the good fight around the bargaining table.

But, we do not disagree on what we are trying to achieve -- what is best for America and for all the American people.

↳ We all recognize the great issues this year. First, there is Vietnam.

↳ I have spoken to the nation on that subject -- and about the *dangerous* arms race.

↳ Last Saturday night, I spoke to all Americans in great detail about the problems of reducing crime and violence in America -- of achieving peace at home.

*Phil Hart  
Walker Cislak*

I have spoken out because I believe you have a right to know.!

*Others should do the same!*

You need to know, too, what is going to happen to the American

economy -- the engine that drives our entire system. . . that produces  
the revenue. . . the jobs. . . the profits. . . the unexcelled American  
standard of living. . . in fact, the engine that makes everything else  
possible. !

↳ A healthy, expanding economy makes a great difference in our  
lives.

↳ For most of us, it makes the difference on the one hand between  
rising incomes. . . profits. . . expanding industry. . . and on the other,  
unsold automobiles. . . sluggish inventories. . . lower payrolls. . . or  
no profits at all.

↳ For some it means the difference between having a job and not  
having a job. . . between keeping a family together and seeing it fall  
apart.

↳ For others it means the difference between sending a youngster to college ~~and~~ wasting his potential for a lifetime.

↳ For our cities it can mean the difference between reprieve and disaster.

↳ Now let me give you some straight talk about our economy.

First, the Republican record on the economy is not nearly as good as the Democratic record.

In the 1950's —  
You know that the last time Mr. Nixon held public office, we had three job-killing, profit-killing recessions in eight years.

↳ During the 1960's, we have had steady economic growth --  
92 straight months.

↳ We more than doubled corporate profits have more than doubled

↳ Dividends have gone up 66 percent. And we have brought an there has been

an increase in real income after taxes for the average family of four of \$3000.

Michigan  
Yes, here in Detroit you know that difference is an increase in  
automobile sales of more than 40 percent in the last eight years, and an  
increase in profits half again as much as that.

Let's look at the key question of employment.

↳ At the end of Mr. Nixon's last term of office, in 1961, nearly seven percent of all Americans who wanted to work didn't have jobs. ↳ In eight years, unemployment had gone up by two million.

↳ Since then, unemployment has gone down by two million, and the Kennedy-Johnson Administrations have cut the unemployment rate in half, to the lowest level of unemployment in 15 years.

↳ At the same time, we have added 10 million more jobs to the economy.

↳ Mr. Nixon's chief economic adviser tells us that there should be more unemployment . . . more people out of jobs as the answer to inflation.

~~↳ Creating unemployment is a cry of defeat in the battle against inflation — especially when it is the fore-runner of recession.~~

↳ There is a better answer -- more humane and more efficient  
an answer.

*Proposal for Price Stability*

I have presented a detailed ~~plan~~ plan for ending inflation while having full employment and vigorous economic growth.

This plan includes:

-- A responsible monetary and fiscal policy;

-- Improved match of labor skills to labor needs;

-- New efforts to strengthen free competition;

-- Stimulation of increased productivity and reduced costs

through tax incentives and increases in investment;

-- And a new, realistic policy on wage-price stability,

to be worked out by labor and management together, and aided

by a wage-price conference in the Executive Office of the President.

We can achieve reasonable price stability, just as we did from 1960 to 1965. - *Price Stability - war + no controls*

And we can do it without old-fashioned. . . defeatist. . . explosive. . . costly. . . increases in unemployment or sacrifices in economic growth.

L What else does Mr. Nixon tell us about the economy?

L He says he will take people off the welfare rolls and put them on payrolls -- something Democrats have been doing for years.

L But what has he done about it? -- Besides trying to make us believe he can put more people to work and have more unemployment at the same time?

L When Mr. Nixon last held public office, the Republican Administration grossly neglected job training.

L Not one single new federal program was begun to train or retrain Americans to hold a job.

L ~~He~~ <sup>They</sup> had his chance to take people off welfare rolls and put them on payrolls, and he did nothing about it. And America paid the bill.

Z Now look at the Democratic record.

*Handwritten signature*

↳ After eight years of the Kennedy-Johnson and Johnson-Humphrey Administrations, new programs that we started are in one single year training and re-training over one million Americans.

↳ And they are training Americans to find jobs. . . keep those jobs. . . earn living wages for themselves and their families. . . and pay taxes.

↳ And you know this job - retraining helps fight inflation by increasing labor mobility.

That is what we have done about the problem. And we're going to do much, much more -- until there is not a man or woman in this country who can't find work because he lacks the skills to do the job.

What about poverty?

↳ I say that fighting poverty is just as much an economic necessity as it is a matter of social justice.

↳ In the past eight years we have brought 12 million people up from poverty.

What does that mean?

↳ It means that there are 12 million more Americans supporting their country ... not being supported by it ... buying cars ... taking part in the economic life of this nation.

↳ ~~The end of poverty means: men and women with decent jobs at decent wages and no longer being a public charge.~~

↳ ~~What have Mr. Nixon and the Republicans done to bring people up from poverty ... to lead useful, productive, profitable lives and to support their country?~~

1950's ~~No poverty or job-training programs. !~~

↳ And what does he propose?

He says that private industry should do something about finding jobs for those Americans who are out of work.

~~New Deal~~

*Lets hear*

*Republican*

*the Republican candidate proposes*

*It seems that*  
L ~~This is just another example of that old adage.~~ When

Mr. Nixon comes out with a good idea, someone else has already done something about it.

~~Franklin~~  
L In the last nine months, the National Alliance of Businessmen -- a partnership of government and industry ... led by the top business leaders of America, including Henry Ford -- has obtained pledges from American industry to provide 310,000 new jobs for the hard-core unemployed and disadvantaged youngsters.

L Nearly 190,000 of these out-of-work Americans have already been placed on the job, ~~including more than 60,000 of the hard-core unemployed.~~

L Think of it -- 190,000 people put to work in nine months ... with firm plans to find jobs for 500,000 Americans within three years.

L Some of you sitting here, tonight, are taking part in this effort. It is you who deserve the gratitude of our nation

on cities

"as the Strait Strains to do more,  
the Private Sector is  
constrained to do less

May 1971

↳ Urban Coalition  
↳ Life Insurance  
↳ Unions.

for doing something about this crucial problem facing our country.

~~↳ You do it not because it is partisan ... but because it is right.~~

↳ There is much more that we both can do -- not through platitudes on cooperation, but through the concrete plans that I have drawn up. I mean plans like the Urban Development Bank, and my Marshall Plan for the Cities. *(New Detroit Committee)*

↳ Both of these plans need your help ... because they are hard-headed efforts to bring government and business together in partnership to solve the problems of our cities.

↳ And there is one other idea that Mr. Nixon has advanced to help our economy. He wants to see more black capitalism.

↳ Well, Mr. Nixon, so do I.

I want every American to have a chance to stand on his own feet ... to run the risks of free enterprise ... to own his own

own business ... to make a profit if he can ... and to contribute to the strength of our economy.

↳ There is only one difference: Mr. Nixon is talking about black capitalism, and we Democrats are doing something about it.

↳ Since last June -- that's in the last four months -- the Small Business Administration, through Project Own, has doubled the number of loans to black Americans to start their own businesses ... and has increased the overall number of loans for anyone who wants to go into business by 12 percent.

↳ We did it with less federal money than last year -- by getting private help.

↳ Howard Samuels of SBA and I put this program together -- and I am going to see that it is extended from today's 26 target cities to every city in America.

↳ As I've said, we don't talk -- we act. !

↳ And we are going to keep on acting ... and working ...  
until we help every American who wants to start his own  
business ... who has the talent and the will ... to do just that

\* \* \*

↳ Finally, both you and I are concerned in America about  
two basic economic goals -- both stability and growth.

↳ Whenever I talk to business and labor leaders, I see  
growing recognition of the importance of these two goals.

↳ We must not accept inflation; <sup>and</sup> we cannot tolerate stagnation;  
and we will not go down the primrose path to government direct  
controls on wages and prices.

↳ Rather, we must travel a different highway.

The government must use fiscal and monetary policies  
to keep our growth steady and sustainable.

↳ It must help to break bottlenecks and strengthen free  
markets.

↳ It must review all its programs with price stability in mind.

↳ <sup>help to</sup> It must improve productivity and efficiency through training and mobility of workers and stimulate more investment and modernization by business.

↳ And it must work with business and labor toward greater wage-price stability.

~~↳ I know I can work with both business and labor.~~

↳ I believe that much more can be done with active business and labor participation in voluntary and cooperative efforts to fight inflation.

↳ Before Americans choose their economic managers for the next four years, they should review the issues carefully.

↳ In particular they will remember the problems they don't have today, as well as those they do.

↳ The businessman will remember that profits bounced up and down during the fifties, never rising for two successive years.

↳ He will remember that profits have increased on the average each year under the Democrats by more than in eight years combined of Republican administrations.

↳ The American worker will remember the era when he opened each paycheck with <sup>envelope</sup> the dread that he might find a layoff notice in his envelope.

↳ The American consumer will recognize the income gains that have provided far greater purchasing power in recent years.

↳ When Americans vote on prosperity, I am confident they will give us a clear call for more of it.

And I say we can get it.

\* \* \*

↳ And we will get it -- not just because we are interested in profits or dividends for their own sake.

↳ We will get it because we know that the health of our American economy is the one thing on which everything else depends.

↳ We know that -- with a recession or depression -- this country will be in <sup>for</sup> more than economic trouble. It will be headed for social explosion.

↳ We know that -- with a weak economy -- our security will be threatened and the festering problems of our cities will get that much worse.

↳ But if we do what we know we can, we can take this country and build it so strong and free that nobody will be able to tear it down.

We will make our cities safe and liveable places once again.

↳ We will do something about the transportation crisis in America -- getting there now is not half the fun.

We will help make every American a tax-paying, productive citizen.

We will make the investments we know we must make in the education and health of our people.

And we will make this a better country for our children after us.

That's what you want.

That's what I want.

If you will put your trust in me, that's what we will have.

# # #

Michigan was the only state in the ~~xxxx~~ entire United States where real per capita income dropped between 1953 and 1960. The record in the whole nation was bad enough - an increase of only 9% - but Michigan dropped 5%.

In contrast, from 1960 to 1967 the real income person rose 32% for an average of 4% a year. This is even higher than the national figure of 3.6% a year.

In 1958 unemployment in Michigan was 13.8 per cent - against a national figure of 6.8 per cent. One in seven of your labor force was jobless. When the Democratic Administration took over in 1961, one of ten was still ~~xxxx~~ unemployed. By 1968 unemployment was down to less than 4%

Non-agricultural jobs dropped by 105,000 - or 4 per cent - 1953 - 1960. Between 1960 and 1967 the number of persons on payrolls increased by 491,000, or 21 per cent.

Michigan

OK  
ATTN EV MUNSEY AND JOHN STEWART

FINAL

REVISED COBO HALL, ECONOMIC CLUB SPEECH FOR DETROIT

FOR RELEASE: FRIDAY AMS

REMARKS

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY  
ECONOMIC CLUB, COBO HALL  
DETROIT, MICHIGAN  
OCTOBER 17, 1968

TONIGHT, WE ARE TOGETHER -- BUSINESS . . . LABOR . . . AND GOVERNMENT.

WE MAY DISAGREE ON DETAILS.

WE MAY FIGHT THE GOOD FIGHT AROUND THE BARGAINING TABLE.

BUT WE DO NOT DISAGREE ON WHAT WE ARE TRYING TO ACHIEVE -- WHAT IS  
BEST FOR AMERICAN AND FOR ALL THE AMERICAN PEOLXXX PEOPLE.

WE ALL RECOGNIZE THE GREAT ISSUES THIS YEAR. FIRST, THERE IS VIETNAM.

I HAVE SPOKEN TO THE NATION ON THAT SUBJECT -- AND ABOUT THE ARMS  
RACE.

LAST SATURDAY NIGHT, I SPOKE TO ALL AMERICANS IN GREAT DETAIL ABOUT

THE PROBLEMS OF REDUCING CRIME AND VIOLENCE IN AMERICA -- OF  
ACHIEVING PEACE AT HOME.

I HAVE SPOKEN OUT BECAUSE I BELIEVE YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO OXXX KNOW.

YOU NEED TO KNOW, TOO, WHAT IS GOING TO HAPPEN TO THE AMERICAN  
ECONOMY -- THE ENIGINE THATXXX ENGINE THAT DRIVES OUR ENTIRE SYSTEM  
. . . THAT PRODUCES THE REVENUE . . . THE JOBS . . . THE PROFITS . . .  
THE EXXXX UNEXCELLED AMERICAN STANDRXXX STANDARD OF LIVING . . . IN  
FACT, THE ENGINE THAT MAKES EVERYTHING ELSE POSSIBLE.

A HEALTHY, EXPANDING ECONOMY MAKES A GREAT DIFFERENCE IN OUR LIVES.

AFORXXX

FRXXX FOR MOST OF US, IT MAKES THE DIFFERENCE ON THE ONE HAND BETWEEN  
RISING INCOMES . . . PROFITS . . . EXPANDING INDUSTRY . . . AND ON THE  
OTHER, UNSOLD AUTOMOBILES . . . SLUGGISH INVENTORIES . . . LOWER  
PAYROLLS. . . OR NO PROFITS AT ALL.

FOR SOME IT MEANS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN HAVING A JOB AND NOT HAVE  
ING A JOB . . . BETWEEN KEEPING A FAMILY TOGETHER AND SEEING IT FALL  
APART.

FOR OTHERS IT MEANS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SEDSSS XXX SENDING A  
YOUNGSTER TO COLLEGE AND WASTING HIS POTENTIAL FOR A LIFETIME.

FOR OUR CITIES IT CAN MEAN THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN REPRIEVE AND DISASTER.

NOW LET ME GIVE YOU SOME STRAIGHT TALK ABOUT OUR ECONOMY.

FIRST, THE REPUBLICAN RECORD ON THE ECONOMY IS NOT NEARLY AS GOOD  
AS THE DEMOCRATIC RECORD.

2  
YOU KNOW THAT THE LAST TIME MR. NIXON HELD PUBLIC OFFICE, WE HAD THREE JOB-KILLING, PROFIT KILLING RECESSIONS IN EIGHT YEARS.

DURING THE 1960'S, WE HAVE HAD STEADY ECONOMIC GROWTH -- 92 STRAIGHT MONTHS.

WE MORE THAN DOUBLED CORPORATE PROFITS.

DIVIDENDS HAVE GONE UP 66 PER CENT. AND WE HAVE BROUGHT AN INCREASE IN REAL INCOME AFTER TAXES FOR THE AVERAGE FAMILY OF FOUR OF \$3000.

YES, HERE IN DETROIT YOU KNOW THAT DIFFERENCE IS AN INCREASE IN AUTOMOBILE SALES OF MOEXXX MORE THAN 40 PER CENT IN THE LAST EIGHT YEARS, AND AN INCREASE IN PROFITS HALF AGAIN AS MUCH AS THAT.

LET'S LOOK AT THE KEY QUESTION OF EMPLOYMENT.

AT THE END OF MR. NIXON'S LAST TERM OF OFFICE, IN 1961, NEARLY SEVEN PERCENT OF ALL AMERICANS WHO WANTED TO WORK DIDN'T HAVE JOBS. IN EIGHT YEARS, UNEMPLOYMENT HAD GONE UP BY TWO MILLION.

SINCE THEN, UNEMPLOYMENT HAS GONE DOWN BY TWO MILLION, AND THE KENNEDY-JOHNSON ADMINISTRATIONS HAVE CUT THE UNEMPLOYMENT RATE IN HALF, TO THE LOWEST LEVEL OF UNEMPLOYMENT IN 15 YEARS.

AT THE SAME TIME, WE HAVE ADDED 10 MILLION MORE JOBS TO THE ECONOMY.

MR. NIXON'S CHIEF ECONOMIC ADVISER TELLS US THAT THERE SHOULD BE MORE UNEMPLOYMENT . . . MORE PEOPLE OUT OF JOBS AS THE ANSWER TO INFLATION.

I THINK CREATING UNEMPLOYMENT IS A CRY OF DEFEAT IN THE BATTLE AGAINST INFLATION -- ESPECIALLY WHEN IT IS THE FORERUNNER OF RECESSION.

THERE IS A BETTER ANSWER -- MORE HUMANE AND MORE EFFICIENT AN ANSWER.

I HAVE PRESENTED A DETAILED PLAN FOR ENDING INFLATION WHILE HAVING FULL EMPLOYMENT AND VIGOROUS ECONOMIC GROWTH. THIS PLAN INCLUDES:  
--A RESPONSIBLE MONETARY AND FISCAL POLICY;  
--IMPROVED MATCH OF LABOR SKILLS TO LABOR NEEDS;  
--NEW EFFORTS TO STRENGTHEN FREE COMPETITION;  
--STIMULATION OF INCREASED PRODUCTIVITY AND REDUCED COSTS THROUGH TAX INCENTIVES AND INCREASES IN INVESTMENT;  
--AND A NEW, REALISTIC POLICY ON WAGE-PRICE STABILITY, TO BE WORKED OUT BY LABOR AND XXX AND MANAGEMENT TOGETHER, AND AIDED BY A WAGE-PRICE CONFERENCE IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT.

WE CAN ACHIEVE REASONABLE PRICE STABILITY, JUST AS WE DID FROM 1960 TO 1965.

AND WE CAN DO IT WITHOUT OLD-FASHIONED . . . DEFEATIST . . . EXPLOSIVE . . . COSTLY . . . INCREASES IN UNEMPLOYMENT OR SACRIFIEXXX SACRIFICES IN ECONOMIC GROWTH.

WHAT ELSE DOES MR. NIXON TELL US ABOUT THE ECONOMY?

HE SAYS HE WILL TAKE PEOPLE OFF THE WELFARE ROLLS AND PUT THEM ON PAYROLLS -- SOMETHING DEMOCRATS HAVE BEEN DOING FOR YEARS.

BUT WHAT HAS HE DONE ABOUT IT? -- BESIDES TRYING TO MAKE US BELIEVE HE CAN PUT MORE PEOPLE TO WORK XXX WORK AND HAVE MORE UNEMPLOYMENT AT THE SAME TIME?

WHEN MR. NIXON LAST HELD PUBLIC OFFICE, THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION GROSSLY NEGLECTED JOB TRAINING. ) . SHOULD BE,

NOT ONE SINGLE NEW FEDERAL PROGRAM WAS BEGUN TO TRAIN OR RETRAIN AMERICANS TO HOLD A JOB.

2  
HE HAD HIS CHANCE TO TAKE PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS AND PUT THEM ON PAYROLLS, AND HE DID NOTHING ABOUT IT. AND AMERICA PAID THE BILL.

NOW LOOK AT THE DEMOCRATIC RECORD.

AFTER EIGHT YEARS OF THE KENNEDY-JOHNSON AND JOHNSON-HUMPHREY ADMINISTRATIONS, NEW PROGRAMS THAT WE STARTED ARE IN ONE SINGLE YEAR TRAINING AND RETRAINING OVER ONE MILLION AMERICANS.

AND THEY ARE TRAINING AMERICANS TO FIND JOBS . . . KEEP THOSE JOBS . . . EARN LIVING WAGES FOR THEMSELVES AND THEIR FAMILIES . . . AND PAY TAXES

AND YOU KNOW THIS JOB TREXXX RE-TRAINING HELPS FIGHT INFLATION BY INCREASING LABOR MOBILITY.

THAT IS WHAT WE HAVE DONE ABOUT THE PROBLEM. AND WE'RE GOING TO DO MUCH, MUCH MORE -- UNTIL THERE IS NOT A MAN OR WOMEN IN THIS COUNTRY WHO CAN'T FIND WORK BECAUSE HE LACKS THE SKILLS TO DO THE JOB.

WHAT ABOUT POVERTY?

I SAY THAT FIGHTING POVERTY IS JUST AS UXXX MUCH AN ECONOMIC NECESSITY AS IT IS A MATTER OF SOCIAL JUSTICE.

IN THE PAST EIGHT YEARS WE HAVE BROUGHT 12 MILLION PEOPLE UP FROM POVERTY.

WHAT DOES THAT MEAN/?

IT MEANS THAT THERE ARE 12 MILLION MORE AMERICANS SUPPOTXXX SUPPORTING THEIR COUNTRY . . . NOT BEING SUPPORTED BY IT . . . BUYING CARS. . . TAKING PART IN THE ECONOMIC LIFE OF THIS NATION.

THE END OF POVERTY MEANS: MEN AND WOMEN WITH DECENT JOBS AT DECENT WAGES AND NO LONGER BEING A PUBLIC CHARGE.

WE HAVE MR. NIXON AND THE REPUBLICANS DONE TOXXX  
WHAT HAVE MR. NIXON AND THE REPUBLICANS DONE TO BRING PEOPLE UP FROM POVERTY . . . TO LEAD USEFUL, PRODUCTIVE, PROFITABLE LIVES AND TO SUPPORT THEIR COUNTRY? LOOK AT THE RECORD OF THE 1950'S; NO POVERTY OR JOB-TRAINING PROGRAMS.

AND WHAT DOES HE PROPOSE?

HE SAYS THAT PRIVATE INDUSTRY SHOULD DO SOMETHING ABOUT FINDING JOBS FOR THOSE AMERICANS WHO ARE OUT OF WORK.

THIS IS JUST ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF THAT OLD ADAGE: WHEN MR. NIXON COMES OUT WITH A GOOD IDEA, SOMEONE ELSE HAS ALREADY DONE SOMETHING ABOUT IT.

IN THE AXXX LAST NINE MONTHS, THE NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF BUSINESSMEN -- A PARTNERSHIP OF GOVERNMENT AND INDUSTRY . . . LED BY THE TOP BUSINESS LEADERS OF AMERICA, INCLUDING HENRY FORD -- HAS OBTAINED PLEDGES FROM AMERICAN INDUSTRY TO PROVIDE 310-,000 NEW JOBS FOR THE HARD-CORE UNEMPLOY AND DISADVANTAGED YOUNGSTERS.

NEARLY, 190,000 OF THESE OUT OF WORK AMERICANS HAVE ALREADY BEEN PLACED ON THE JOB, INCLUDING MORE THAN 60,000 OF THE HARD-CORE UNEMPLOYED.

THINK OF IT -- 190,000 PEOPLE PUT TO WORK IN NINE MONTHS. . . WITH FIRM PLANS TO FIND JOBS FOR 500,000 AMERICANS WITHIN THREE YEARS.

SOME OF YOUR XXX YOU SITTING HERE, TONIGHT, ARE TAKING PART IN THIS EFFORT. IT IS YOU WHO DESERVE THE GRATITUDE OF OUR NATION FOR DOING SOMETHING ABOUT THIS CRUCIAL PROBLEM FACING OUR COUNTRY.

YOU DO IT NOT BECAUSE IT IS PARTISAN . . . BUT BECAUSE I XXX IT IS RIGHT.

THERE IS MUCH MORE THAT WE BOTH CAN DO -- NOT THROUGH PLATITUDES ON COOPERATION, BUT THROUGH THE CONCRETE PLANS THAT I HAVE DRAWN UP.

I MEAN PLANS LIKE THE URBAN DEVELOPMENT BANK, AND MY MARSHALL PLAN FOR THE CITIES.

BOTH OF THESE PLANS NEEDSXXX NEED YOUR HELP. . . BECAUSE THEY ARE HARD-HEADED EFFORTS TO BRING GOVERNMENT AND BUSINESS TOGETHER IN PARTNERSHIP TO SOLVE THE PROBLEMS OF OUR CITIES.

AND THERE IS ONE OTHER IDEA THAT MR. NIXON HAS ADVANCED TO HELP OUR ECONOMY. HE WANTS TO SEE MORE BLACK CAPITALISM.

WELL, MR. NIXON, SO DO I.

I WANT EVERY AMERICAN TO HAVE A CHANCE TO STAND ON HIS OWN TWO FEET . . . TO RUN THE RISKS OF FREE ENTERPRISE . . . TO OWN HIS OWN BUSINESS . . . TO MAKE A PROFIT IF HE CAN . . . AND TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE STRENGTH OF OUR ECONOMY.

THERE IS ONLY ONE DIFFERENCE: MR. NIXON IS TALKING ABOUT BLACK CAPITALISM, AND WE DEMOCRATS ARE DOING SOMETHING ABOUT IT.

SINCE LAST JUNE, -- THAT'S IN THE LAST FOUR MONTHS -- THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, THROUGH PROJECT OWN, HAS DOUBLED THE NUMBER OF LOANS TO BLACK AMERICANS TO START THEIR OWN BUSINESSES . . . AND HAS INCREASED THE OVERALL NUMBER OF LOANS FOR ANYONE WHO WANTS TO GO INTO BUSINESS BY 12 PER CENT.

WE DID IT WITH LESS FEDERAL MONEY THAN LAST YEAR -- BY GETTING PRIVATE HELP.

HOWARD SAMUELS OF SBA AND I PUT THIS PROGRAM TOGETHER -- AND I AM GOING TO SEE THAT IT IS EXTENDED FROM TODAY'S 26 TARGET CITIES TO EVERY CITY IN AMERICA.

AS I'VE SAID, WE DON'T TALK -- WE ACT.

AND WE ARE GOING TO KEEP ON ACTING . . . AND WORKING . . . UNTIL WE HELP EVERY AMERICAN WHO WANTS TO START HIS OWN BUSINESS . . . WHO HAS THE TALENT AND THE WILL . . . TO DO JUST THAT.

\* \* \*

FINALLY, BOTH YOU AND I ARE CONCERNED IN AMERICA ABOUT TWO BASIC ECONOMIC GOALS -- BOTH STABILITY AND GROWTH.

WHENEVER I TALK TO BUSINESS AND LABOR LEADERS, I SEE GROWING RECOGNITION OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THESE TWO GOALS.

h  
WE MUST NOT ACCEPT INFLATION; WE CANNOT TOLERATE STAGNATION; AND WE WILL NOT GO DOWN THE PRIMROSE ;XXX PATH TO GOVERNMENT DIRECT CONTROLS ON WAGES AND PRICES.

RATHER, WE MUST TRAVEL A DIFFERENT HIGHWAY.

THE GOVERNMENT MUST USE FISCAL AND MONETARY POLICIES TO KEEP OUR GROWTH STEADY AND SUSTAINABLE.

IT MUST HELP TO BREAK BOTTLENECKS AND STRENGTHEN FREE MARKETS.

IT MUST REVIEW ALL ITS PRORCCC PROGRAMS WITH PRICE STABILITY IN MIND.

IT MUST IMPROVE PRODUCTIVITY AND EFFICIENCY THROUGH TRAINING AND MOBILITY OF WORKERS AND STIMULATE MORE INVESTMENT AND MODERNIZATION BY BSXXX BUSINESS.

AND IT MUST WORK WITH BUSINESS AND LABOR TOWARD GREATER WAGE-PRICE STABILITY.

I KNOW I CAN WORK WITH BOTH BUSINESS AND LABOR.

I BELIEVE THAT MUCH MORE CAN BE DONE WITH ACTIVE BUSINESS AND LABOR PARTICIPATION IN VOLUNTARY AND COOPERATIVE EFFORTS TO TIGHTXXX FIGHT INFLATION.

BEFORE AMERICANS WHOOSE THEIR ECONOMIC MANAGERS FOR THE NEXT FOUR YEARS, THEY SHOULD REVIEW THE ISSUES CAREFULLY.

IN PARTICULAR THEY WILL REMEMBER THE PRLEMEXXX PROBLEMS THEY DON'T HAVE TODAY, AS WELL AS THOSE THEY DO.

THE BUSINESSMAN WILL REMEMBER THAT PROFITS BOUNCED UP AND DOWN DURING THE FIFTIES, NEVER RISING FOR TWO SUCCESSIVE YEARS. HE WILL REMEBXXX REMEMBER THAT PROFITS HAVE INCREASED ON THE AVERAGE EACH YEAR UNDER THE DEMOCRATS BY MORE THAN IN EIGHT YEARS COMBINED OF REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATIONS.

THE AMERICAN WORKER WILL REMEMBER THE ERA WHEN HE OPENED EACH PAYCHECK WITH THE DREAD THAT HE MIGHT FIND A LAYOFF NOTICE IN HIS ENVELOPE.

THE AMERICAN CONSUMER WILL RECOGNIZE THE INCOME GAINS THAT HAVE PROVIDED FAR GREATER PURCHASING POWER IN RECENT YEARS.

WHAT AMERICANS VOTE ON PROSPERITY, I AM CONFIDENT THEY WILL GVXXX GIVE US A CLEAR CALL FOR MORE OF IT.

AND I SAY WE CAN GET IT.

\* \* \*

AND WE WILL GET IT -- NOT JUST BECAUSE WE ARE INTERESTED IN PROFITS OR DIVIDENDS FOR THEIR OWN SAKE.

WE WILL GET IT BECAUSE WE KNOW THAT THE HEALTH OF OUR AMERICAN ECONOMY IS THE ONE THING ON WHICH EVERYTHING ELSE DEPENDS.

6  
WE KNOW THAT -- WITH A RECESSION OR DEPRESSION -- THIS  
COUNTRY WILL BE IN MORE THAN ECONOMIC TROUBLE. IT WILL BE HEADED  
FOR SOCIAL EXPLOSION.

WE KNOW THAT -- WITH A WEAK ECONOMY -- OUR SECURITY WILL BE  
THREATENED AND THE FESTERING PROBLEMS OF OUR CIICXXX CITIES WILL GET  
THAT MUCH WORSE.

BUT IF WE DO WHAT WE KNOW WE CAN, WE CAN TAKE THIS COUNTRY AND  
BUILD IT SO STRONG AND FFREE THAT NOBODY WILL BE ABLE TO TEAR IT DOWN.

WE WILL MAKE OUR CITIES SAFE AND LIVEABLE PLACES ONCE AGAIN.

WE WILL DO SOMETHING ABOUT THE TRANSPORTATION CRISIS IN AMERICA  
GETTING THERE IS NO T HALF THE FUN.

WE WILL HELP MAKE EVERY AMERICAN A TAX-PAYING, PRODUCTIVE CITIZEN.

WE WILL MAKE THE INVESTMENTS WE KNOW WE MUST MAKE IN THE EDUCATION  
AND HEALTH OF OUR PEOPLE.

AND WE WILL MAKE THIS A BETTER COUNTRY FOR OUR CHILDREN AFTER  
ALL.

THAT7S WHAT YOU WANT.

THAT'S WHAT I WANT.

IF YOU WILL PUT YOUR TRUST IN ME, THAT'S WHAT WE WILL HAVE.

### END OF THAT TEXT.



# 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](http://www.mnhs.org)