

The National Broadcasting Company Presents



MEET THE PRESS

America's Press Conference of the Air

Produced by LAWRENCE E. SPIVAK

Guest: SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
(*Democrat, Minnesota*)

VOLUME 16

SUNDAY, MARCH 12, 1972

NUMBER 11

Merkle Press Inc.

Printers and Periodical Publishers

Division of Publishers Co. Inc.

Box 2111, Washington, D. C. 20013

10 cents per copy

Panel: HUGH SIDEY, *Time & Life*
DAVID S. BRODER, *Washington Post*
NEIL SHEEHAN, *The New York Times*
DOUGLAS KIKER, *NBC News*

Moderator: BILL MONROE, *NBC News*

Permission is hereby granted to news media and magazines to reproduce in whole or in part. Credit to NBC's MEET THE PRESS will be appreciated.

MEET THE PRESS

MR. SPIVAK: Our guest today on MEET THE PRESS is Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota, a candidate for the 1972 Democratic presidential nomination. Senator Humphrey was Vice President during the Johnson Administration and the Democratic presidential nominee in 1968.

Senator, I'd like to start the questions with this: According to some of your friends, and many of your critics, you face at least two major obstacles in getting the Democratic nomination this time, and I'd like your answers to the questions they raise.

First, since you lost to Richard Nixon in 1968, why should you be nominated again, rather than one of the other candidates?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: The loss was very close, and I think if you recall we had tremendous momentum in the final part of that campaign, picking up about eight million votes in the last three weeks, according to the people that calculated the election results. I have several months between now and November, and if I could pick up eight million votes in three weeks, I think that I can pick up enough votes, may I say, to win in 1972. I haven't the slightest doubt that that is very possible.

MR. SPIVAK: Senator, they say, however, that you have lost a great many votes because you identify too closely with yesterday's politics and yesterday's programs, when both the young and the liberals are calling for new politics and new programs. How do you respond to that?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think what the American people are calling for is experience. I think they are calling for a steady hand. I think they are calling for insight into the problems of tomorrow as well as those of today. I offer the people of the United States experience—a Mayor, a Senator, a Majority Whip, a Vice-President. I have traveled the length and breadth of this country. I think I have some idea about the international scene, knowing the people. I am now a Senator, and I make new proposals. I think it is fair to say that I am not old hat. In fact, what I am really offering is new proposals for a new day in American public life. I haven't the slightest doubt but that we can offer what the people need.

(Announcements)

MR. BRODER: Senator Humphrey, the Florida primary Tuesday is your first chance to prove that you are a winner. Do you expect to win in Florida?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I expect to do very well, Mr. Broder. I hesitate to get into the numbers game. Ever since New Hampshire I have thought this was a rather hazardous pursuit. We are doing well. I think we have good momentum, and I believe I am the only progressive Democrat that has a chance to beat Mr. Wallace.

MR. BRODER: What does it say about your candidacy if Mr. Wallace beats you in Florida?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: First of all, I don't like to look on the negative side, as you know, but if that should happen, I think all it says simply is, with 11 candidates in the field, it is entirely possible. Mr. Wallace has a solid block, as we know, that always reports for duty every time he is up for election, and I think you would have to look at the percentage, the total percentage of the others outside of Mr. Wallace. It would do nothing to damage my candidacy in the Democratic party if Mr. Wallace should win, because I do not consider Mr. Wallace to be what I call a card-carrying Democrat.

MR. BRODER: Senator, on the Today Show on February 11th, you said, "It is my judgment that Mr. Wallace's strength in Florida has waned. In 1968 I defeated Mr. Wallace in Florida. I think people may have forgotten that. I have the feeling that we may pull an upset." Those are your quotes?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: That is correct.

MR. BRODER: Do you still feel that that is possible?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: There were three candidates in

1968: Mr. Nixon, Mr. Wallace and myself. I defeated Mr. Wallace. Mr. Nixon defeated both of us. It is an entirely different show than it is now. Now you will find 11 candidates, and we have to divide up a spectrum, so to speak, or a pie in many small pieces, so I don't think the situations are comparable. But we are going to do very well.

MR. BRODER: It is the same situation as you faced on February 11th when you made that prediction about an upset.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Let's hope we do. You know I'd like to see that. That would be some real top-grade news.

MR. SHEEHAN: Senator, I'd like to switch from the numbers game, as you called it, to the Vietnam War. Mr. McGovern said recently that if nominated and if elected he would withdraw our troops from Vietnam within ninety days after he took office. If nominated and if elected, how long would Hubert Humphrey take before he withdrew all of our troops from Vietnam?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I don't think that is an unreasonable figure. I didn't recall that Senator McGovern had made that specific a date line, but in light of the fact that we have been withdrawing troops from Vietnam longer than it took us to defeat Hitler in World War II, I think an additional ninety days after January 20th sounds rather reasonable, as a matter of fact. It may even be a little extended.

MR. SHEEHAN: A follow-on to that if I may, Senator. When we talk about withdrawing troops from Vietnam, I think it is only fair to admit, to concede, that if one takes all American troops out of Vietnam, a Communist government may come to power in Saigon. Are you willing to see a Communist government come to power in Saigon as a result of withdrawing American troops from that country?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Sheehan, this is all a matter of a man's judgment and his own evaluation of what might happen. In other words, the "maybe" game, or the "might" game. I am not sure of what is going to happen, but this I am sure of, that it is long past time for us to be out of Vietnam. We should do this for our own national interests as a matter of highest national policy.

I also believe that we are leaving South Vietnam with a powerful military force, over a million men trained in the regular armed forces, the fifth largest Navy. They have the best equipment that this country has been able to produce, and we have supplied it to them in vast quantities. They have billions of dollars of equipment in surplus. They have 500,000 troops in the militia, and I have a feeling that if a government and a country

with that amount of equipment and manpower can't take care of itself after ten of the best years of our lives having been given to that country, there is no reason at all for us to stay a single extra day.

MR. SHEEHAN: Are you saying then, sir, that you are willing to take the risk—

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am willing to take the risk because I don't think it is a risk that is really going to materialize.

MR. SIDEY: Senator, you have had a lot to say about taxes in your campaigns down there. I have read the litany about the loopholes and special privileges and that. I gather that you think the rich in this country are too rich, is that correct?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I gather that what I think is that the rich in this country get too many special privileges. I am not opposed to people being well to do and rich. As a matter of fact, I'd like to see more people have more income. But I don't think it is fair to load an undue burden of taxes upon middle income Americans, upon the wage earner, the hourly wage rate earner, the weekly, the monthly wage earner, and to let a handful of people in this country—and it is a very small number, but with tremendous wealth—literally have every special privilege and every tax loophole that the modern mind of the legal fraternity can figure out.

MR. SIDEY: According to your program, there would be immense expenses for increased social security and the other things you advocate. Is it realistic to expect the closing of these loopholes to pay for that, that only?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think it is realistic to expect that, if you could get a President that would have the courage and the sense of fair play and justice to lead the fight for a change, for tax justice and tax reform, and not just to go along with the pack, not just to let the lobbyists work the precincts up there on Capitol Hill, build up particular little nests of power and special privilege areas. I think a President must be the full representative of all of the American people, and he ought to lay it on the line. He ought to point out that there were over 300 people in this country in the last two years with incomes over \$250,000 that didn't pay a single dime of tax, that there were thousands of them with incomes over \$20,000 that didn't pay any taxes, and he ought to point out that there were eight oil companies in this country with incomes of over \$2 billion that paid a smaller percentage of tax on that income than an \$8,000 salaried man with a wife and two children.

I don't think that is fair. What this country needs is a Presi-

dent that will speak for the people and the average working family. I want to be that President, and I am going to do it.

MR. SIDEY: Mr. Humphrey, you suggest a rather unholy alliance between the current administration and the corporate structure of America. Is it any different than when you had power?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, I think it is different, considerably different, more possibly in degree rather than in tenets, or basic philosophy. But this administration just knows who its friends are, and the people that are looking in on this television show are not included in that circle, an awful lot of them. It keeps its word with its friends, it really does. I want to say for the Nixon administration, it does, it does keep its word to its friends.

MR. SIDEY: Who are its friends?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: The banks, the large banks that made unprecedented profits in this administration in 1969, '70 and '71. The corporate wealth of this country that got a tax break of almost nine to 10 billion dollars in the recent tax bill. This administration takes care of its friends. It even takes care of some of them, according to what I have been reading lately—at least there is some possibility, there is some allegation—in terms of mergers that even affect the Department of Justice.

MR. KIKER: Senator Humphrey, the big issue in the Florida primary and one of the big issues nationally, today, is school busing.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, sir.

MR. KIKER: Some of the candidates in Florida have made it perfectly clear how they stand. Mr. Wallace is against it. Mr. Jackson is against it. Mr. Lindsay is for it. How does Hubert Humphrey stand? Are you for it or against it?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: My position has never changed. I am opposed to massive compulsory busing that has as its sole objective racial balance based on a mathematical formula. I believe in integrated education, I am opposed to segregated education, I think it is fit, right and proper that you bus a child from an inferior school to a good school. I think it is wrong and doesn't make a bit of sense to bus a child from a good school to a poor school, and I think black parents and white parents both feel the same. Busing when it is used to improve the quality of education has its justification. When it is used to settle every racial problem in this country, it becomes divisive and it doesn't help.

MR. KIKER: So you are for one-way busing?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, I am for education. I am for improving the quality of education, and I see that busing can help that if it is used with plain ordinary common sense, Mr. Kiker.

MR. KIKER: Are you against busing white children from affluent, let's say, upper middle class white suburbs into black schools?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, I am not, not if the school is a good school, but I am opposed to busing anybody from a good school to a bad school, white or black. I think you justify busing on what it does for education. I think the problem of race relations in this country will be basically settled when we open up our neighborhoods, when we begin to practice real equal opportunity in corporate business and in government and in education.

MR. KIKER: I get back to a term that I obviously have invented, that is, one-way using. You are for busing, to get it down again, for busing children of both colors from bad schools to good schools.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Correct. I want to help education, that is right.

MR. KIKER: And you are against busing school children from good schools to bad schools.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Bad schools with poor teachers, exactly.

MR. KIKER: It really comes down to black and white, doesn't it?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, it doesn't. There are some very fine schools, may I say, that are in black neighborhoods with excellent teachers and good facilities. I just think that the average American has an awful lot of sense, and they don't like to have their children bused long distances simply to satisfy some kind of a mathematical formula. By the way, my position on this hasn't changed a bit. I, just before we came on this program, asked a member of my staff to get my position, which is dated in September, 1971, and here is what it says:

"Busing has its only justification if it improves the quality of education and equality of educational opportunity, but we must view busing as only one method and certainly not always the best solution for accomplishing the equitable desegregation of school districts. Wherever possible we should make full use of other methods," and by the way, the blacks like that, and the whites like it. Just yesterday in the City of Miami, in Florida, I received the unanimous endorsement of the largest black min-

isterial association in the city, so I think we are on pretty good ground.

MR. SPIVAK: Senator, may I ask you a question. Governor Reubin Askew of Florida is risking his political life by asking the citizens of Florida to vote against a resolution which would prohibit forced busing, the first [Resolution]. What would you advise the people of Florida to do on that first resolution, would you ask them to vote for it or against it?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I would ask them to listen to a fine, courageous, decent Governor, and I have supported Reubin Askew's position totally. I do not believe in the Constitutional Amendment process, and I think that Governor Askew has demonstrated the kind of political leadership that is making many an American have new faith in government. I support him totally, and I am delighted to have the chance to say it on this program.

MR. BRODER: Senator, continuing on the same subject, you say your position has not changed at all; you say you favor a broad attack on the problem of school desegregation rather than focusing on busing.

I am puzzled then why you voted, on February 29th of this year, against Senator Ribicoff's amendment to require desegregation of all metropolitan area schools in this country, in authorizing \$1 billion a year of federal funds to support that effort.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I consulted with what we call the Civil Rights Leadership Conference. I thought possibly they would have a pretty good idea as to whether or not this was a good amendment because it involved not one billion of dollars; it involved billions and billions of dollars, and it was a part of a program of amendments in the Congress that I thought was rather confusing. I am happy to say that Hubert Humphrey's votes and the Civil Rights Leadership Conference were right on the same target. They advised me, and I took their advice.

MR. BRODER: That vote not only put you at odds with your colleagues, Senator Mondale, Senator Hart, Senator Kennedy, Senators Bayh, Muskie and McGovern, whom I think most of us would regard as pro-civil rights Senators, it also directly reversed your own vote on that same amendment on April 21st of 1971.

Does that reversal have nothing to do with the Florida primary?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Not one bit, because the issue was entirely different. In 1971 we were voting on the whole subject of desegregated education, and I voted for it then. This time it was another one of the many amendments that was being

brought in as to whether or not you were for a constitutional amendment, and I am opposed to a constitutional amendment. I believe in total desegregation. There isn't the slightest doubt. I don't really think I have to present my credentials; I have been at it for 25 years.

MR. SHEEHAN: Senator, you said earlier in response to a question from Mr. Spivak that you were in favor of new proposals for a new day in American life.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes.

MR. SHEEHAN: What is the most important new idea that you can give us for American life? What is the most important new proposal you have?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I would suggest that the time has arrived in our governmental structure when we need to take a good hard look at how we plan the better use of our resources: what should be our commitments; what should be our priorities; what should be our goals; and how can we mobilize the resources that we need to achieve a particular set of objectives. We have had no plans. We have got one budget each year. It is the most secret document, by the way, of the government. No one knows what is in it, except in the Executive Branch, until it is presented to the Congress. I am proposing a national growth and development policy in which the Congress of the United States, in which state and local governments, and the executive branch of government can start to concentrate their attention on where we ought to go five years from now, ten years from now. What kind of policy should we have for energy, for communication, for transportation; how should we direct our energies and our resources to environmental protection; how will we rebuild our cities?

I submit that the Nixon administration has no urban policy, for example. I believe in planning the proper use of resources, the mobilization of them, learning from the space program, might I add, what you can do if you make up your mind to do it and set some targets and datelines.

MR. SIDEY: Senator, do you believe that Richard Nixon is a total failure as President in his three years?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Sidey, I wouldn't make that accusation because there are some things, of course, that the President has done that I hope the American people will applaud.

MR. SIDEY: What?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: He has withdrawn some troops from Vietnam. For this I am grateful. He has made the visit to

Peking. I support that; I think that was a valuable initiative. He is going to travel to Moscow. We will have to wait to see what comes out of that.

He has made some legislative proposals which I think surely merit what you call a pat on the back, an affirmative response, such as his welfare reform program, even though I don't think it went nearly far enough. But I consider Mr. Nixon's economic policies a colossal failure. I think that those policies have worked an undue hardship upon this country, and today, might I add, that the price control program of the Nixon administration is a hoax, a sham, a public relations gimmick that is not protecting the average wage earner and the working family of this country and is causing great hardship to people on fixed incomes. On that basis his administration is a failure.

MR. SIDEY: You mentioned earlier that this administration, you believe, takes care of its friends.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes.

MR. SIDEY: Could you go a little further on that? Do you believe the White House was implicated in this ITT matter, which is now being reviewed before the Congress?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I don't know, and I wouldn't want to make that kind of an accusation. I simply say that this particular situation is another one of those examples that erodes confidence in government, that causes suspicion and distrust, and it seems to me that it is something that ought to be clarified promptly. There has to be some kind of an answer to it. It is either true or it isn't true.

MR. SIDEY: What is your feeling about someone like former Secretary of Commerce Stans going out to be chief fund-raiser after dealing in his government capacity with major corporations and businesses?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: He will surely know where the money is and he will know who got the contracts, and may I say the GOP Newsletter is reminding all of those who have been at the government table that they should make generous contributions to the Republican National Committee.

MR. SPIVAK: We have less than three minutes.

MR. KIKER: Senator Humphrey, it is reported last week in Florida you said if elected, ten days later you would be pulling troops out of Vietnam and, in response to a question from Mr. Sheehan you said perhaps ninety days was too long to get them all out. My question is this: If elected, would you be willing to set a date certain?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, sir, I surely would.

MR. KIKER: Would that be predicated upon the release of the prisoners of war?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: It would be predicated upon the release of the prisoners of war. I do not think that any man that is serving as President of the United States, Mr. Kiker, can leave these men, the prisoners of war, rotting in those prison camps in Hanoi and in North Vietnam. I don't think the American people would stand for it, and I think the sooner we tell North Vietnam that we are prepared to withdraw our forces, that we will set a date certain, but simultaneously we will negotiate the release of the prisoners of war with the help of the international community, the better.

MR. KIKER: Adjacent to the Vietnam issue, how do you stand on amnesty?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I do not favor unconditional amnesty. I believe that if those who are to be repatriated who left this country, then they should perform some kind of compensatory civilian service. I would like to bring us all back together. I'd like to see people brought back to this country and be repatriated, but not without some service to country.

MR. SPIVAK: Senator, do you think President Nixon ought to announce his position on forced busing before the Florida primary?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: It would have been helpful, I think, but I didn't expect him to. I hope he will just take a position, that's all.

MR. BRODER: Senator, one of your Florida rivals, Senator Jackson, accused you today of grandstanding by promising to disclose your campaign finances at the last moment before the election. How do you respond to that?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I will disclose my campaign finances. There is no requirement of law, but I think there is a requirement of conscience. I ask every Democrat to do it, and I also ask President Nixon's campaign organization to disclose their finances. I'd like to take a look at that Republican war chest. I'd just like to see how much is in it. I'd like to see who contributed to it. I'd like to see how well Mr. Stans is doing, how well Mr. Mitchell is doing. I'd like to see how much of that corporate money is in there—or from some of the leaders of the corporations. I will disclose, total disclosure.

MR. SPIVAK. We have only thirty seconds.

MR. SHEEHAN: Senator, in relation to the withdrawal of our troops from Vietnam, are you also in favor of stopping military aid to the Saigon government and the use of American air power in Vietnam?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am. I think we have given them all that they need and an over-abundance.

MR. SPIVAK: Senator, that was a nice, brief answer. I am sorry to interrupt; our time is up.

Thank you, Senator Humphrey; for being with us today on MEET THE PRESS.

The Proceedings of

M E E T T H E P R E S S

as broadcast nationwide by the National Broadcasting Company, Inc., are printed and made available to the public to further interest in impartial discussions of questions affecting the public welfare. Transcript may be obtained by sending a stamped, self-addressed envelope and ten cents for each copy to:

Merkle Press Inc. Box 2111, Washington, D. C. 20013

(Division Publishers Co., Inc.)

MEET THE PRESS is telecast every Sunday over the NBC Television Network. This program originated from the NBC Studios in Washington, D.C.

Television Broadcast 1:00-1:30 P.M. EST
Radio Broadcast 6:30-7:00 P.M. EST

PLEASE CREDIT ANY QUOTES OR EXCERPTS FROM THIS NBC RADIO AND TELEVISION PROGRAM TO "NBC'S MEET THE PRESS."

M E E T T H E P R E S S

Produced by Lawrence E. Spivak

SUNDAY, MARCH 12, 1972

GUEST:

SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY (D. Minn.)

MODERATOR:

Lawrence E. Spivak

PANEL:

Hugh Sidey - Time & Life

David S. Broder - Washington Post

Neil Sheehan - The New York Times

Douglas Kiker - NBC News

o o

.....
: This is a rush transcript pro- :
: vided for the information and :
: convenience of the press. Accu- :
: racy is not guaranteed. In case :
: of doubt, please check with :
: MEET THE PRESS :
:

1 MR. SPIVAK: Our guest today on MEET THE PRESS is
2 Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota, a candidate
3 **Democratic**
4 for the 1972/Presidential nomination. Senator Humphrey
5 was Vice President during the Johnson Administration and
6 the Democratic Presidential nominee in 1968.

7 Senator, I'd like to start the questions with this:
8 According to some of your friends, and many of your critics,
9 you face at least two major obstacles in getting the
10 Democratic nomination this time, and I'd like your answer
11 to the questions they raise.

12 First, since you lost to Richard Nixon in 1968,
13 why should you be nominated again, rather than one
14 of the other candidates?

15 SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, Mr. Spivak, the loss was
16 very close and I think if you recall we had tremendous
17 momentum in the final part of that campaign, picking up
18 about eight million votes in the last three weeks,
19 according to the people that calculated the election results.
20 Now I have several months between now and November and
21 if I could pick up eight million votes in three weeks,
22 I think that I can pick up enough votes, may I say, to
23 win in 1972. I haven't the slightest doubt that that is
24 possible.
25

1 MR. SPIVAK: Senator, they say you have lost a great many
2 votes because you identify too closely with yesterday's
3 politics and yesterday's programs, when both the
4 young and the liberals are calling for new politics and new
5 programs. Now, how do you respond to that?

6 SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think what the American people are
7 calling for is experience. I think they are calling for a
8 steady hand. I think they are calling for insight into
9 the problems of tomorrow as well as those of today.

10 I offer the people of the United States experience, a Mayor,
11 a Senator, a Majority Whip, a Vice-President; I have traveled
12 the length and breadth of this country. I think I have some
13 idea about the international scene, knowing the people, and I
14 am now a Senator and I make new proposals. I think it is fair
15 to say that I am not old hat. In fact, what I am really is
16 offering new proposals for a new day in American public life.
17 I haven't the slightest doubt but what we can offer what the
18 people need.

19 MR. BRODER: Senator Humphrey, the Florida Primary
20 Tuesday is your first chance to prove that you are a winner.
21 Do you expect to win in Florida?

22 SENATOR HUMPHREY: I expect to do very well, Mr. Broder.
23 I hesitate to get into the numbers game. Ever since New
24 Hampshire I have thought this was a rather hazardous pursuit.
25 We are doing well; I think we have good momentum and I
believe I am the only progressive Democrat that has a chance

1 to beat Mr. Wallace.

2 MR. BRODER: What does it say about your candidacy if Mr.
3 Wallace beats you in Florida?

4 SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, first of all, I don't like to
5 look on the negative side, as you know, but if that should
6 happen I think all it simply says is, with 11 candidates in
7 the field it is entirely possible that Mr. Wallace has a
8 solid block, as we know, that always reports for duty every
9 time he is up for election, and I think you would have to
10 look at the percentage, the total percentage of the
11 others outside of Mr. Wallace.

12 It would do nothing to damage my candidacy in the
13 Democratic party if Mr. Wallace should win because I do not
14 consider Mr. Wallace to be what I call a card-carrying Democrat.

15 MR. BRODER: Well, Senator, on the Today Show on
16 February 11th, you said "It is my judgment that Mr. Wallace's
17 strength in Florida has waned. . . In 1968 I defeated Mr.
18 Wallace in Florida. I think people may have forgotten that.
19 I have the feeling that we may pull an upset." Those are
20 your quotes?

21 SENATOR HUMPHREY: That is correct.

22 MR. BRODER: Do you still feel that that is possible?

23 SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, there were three candidates in
24 1968. Mr. Nixon, Mr. Wallace and myself. I defeated Mr.
25 Wallace. Mr. Nixon defeated both of us. It is an entirely

1 different show than it is now. Now you will find 11
2 candidates and we have to divide up a spectrum, so to speak, or
3 a pie in many small pieces so I don't think the situations
4 are comparable, but we are going to do very well.

5 MR. BRODER: It is the same situation as you faced on
6 February 11th when you made that prediction about an upset.

7 SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, let's hope we do. You know I'd
8 like to see that. That would be some real top-grade news.

9 MR. SHEEHAN: Senator, I'd like to switch from the
10 numbers game, as you called it, to the Vietnam War. Mr.
11 McGovern said recently that if nominated and if elected he
12 would withdraw our troops from Vietnam within ninety days after
13 he took office. If nominated and if elected, how long would
14 Hubert Humphrey take before he withdrew all of our troops
15 from Vietnam?

16 SENATOR HUMPHREY: I don't think that is an unreasonable
17 figure. I didn't recall that Senator McGovern had made that
18 specific a date line but in light of the fact that we have
19 been withdrawing troops from Vietnam longer than it took us
20 to defeat Hitler in World War II, I think an additional
21 ninety days after January 20th sounds rather reasonable, as
22 a matter of fact. It may even be a little extended.

23 MR. SHEEHAN: A follow-on to that, if I may, Senator.
24 When we talk about withdrawing troops from Vietnam, I think it
25 is only fair to admit, to concede, that if one takes all

1 American troops out of Vietnam, a Communist Government may come
2 to power in Saigon. Now, are you willing to see a Communist
3 Government come to power in Saigon as a result of withdrawing
4 American troops from that country?

5 SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, Mr. Sheehan, this is all a matter
6 of -- this is all a matter of a man's judgment and his own
7 evaluation of what might happen. In other words, the "maybe"
8 game, or the "might" game. I am not sure of what is going to
9 happen, but this I am sure of, that it is long past for us to
10 be out of Vietnam. We should do this for our own national
11 interests as a matter of highest national policy.

12 I also believe that we are leaving South Vietnam with a
13 powerful military force over a million men trained in the
14 regular armed forces, the fifth largest Navy. They have the
15 best equipment that this country has been able to produce,
16 and we have supplied it to them in vast quantities. They
17 have billions of dollars of equipment in surplus. They have
18 500,000 troops in the Malaysia and I have a feeling that
19 if a government and a country with that amount of equipment and
20 manpower can't take care of itself after ten of the best
21 years of our lives, having been given to that country, that
22 there is no reason at all for us to stay a single extra day.

23 MR. SHEEHAN: Are you saying then, sir, that you are
24 willing to take the risk --

25 SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am willing to take the risk because
I don't think it is a risk that is really going to materialize.

1

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. SIDEY: Senator, you have had a lot to say about taxes in your campaigns down there. I have read the litany about the loopholes and special privileges and that. I gather that you think the rich in this country are too rich, is that correct?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I gather that what I think is that the rich in this country get too many special privileges. I am not opposed to people being well to do and rich. As a matter of fact, I'd like to see more people have more income. But I don't think it is fair to load an undue burden of taxes upon middle income Americans, upon the wage earner, the hourly wage rate earner, the weekly, the monthly wage earner, and to let a handful of people in this country -- and it is a very small number, but with tremendous wealth -- literally have every special privilege and every tax loophole that the modern mind of the legal fraternity can figure out.

MR. SIDEY: Well, Senator, according to your program there would be immense expenses for increased Social Security and the other things you advocate. Is it realistic to expect the closing of these loopholes to pay for that, and that only?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, Mr. Sidey, I think it is realistic to expect that if you could get a President that would have the courage and the sense of fair play and justice to

21 lead the fight for a change, for tax justice and tax
2 reform, and not just to go along with the pack, not just
3 to let the lobbyists work the precincts up there on
4 Capitol Hill, build up particular little nests of power
5 and special privilege areas, I think a President must be the
6 full representative of all of the American people, and he
7 ought to lay it on the line. He ought to point out
8 that there were over 300 people in this country in the
9 last two years with incomes over \$250,000 that didn't pay a
10 single dime of tax, that there were thousands of them with
11 incomes over \$20,000 that didn't pay any taxes, and he ought
12 to point out that there were eight oil companies in this
13 country with incomes of over \$2 billion that paid a smaller
14 percentage of tax on that income than an \$8,000 salaried man
15 with a wife and two children.

16 I don't think that is fair. What this country needs is a
17 President that will speak for the people and the average
18 working family and I want to be that/ and I am going to do
19 it.

20 MR. SIDNEY: Mr. Humphrey, you suggest a rather unholy
21 alliance between the current Administration and the corporate
22 structure of America. Is it any different than when you had
23 power?

24 SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, I think it is different, consider-
25 ably different. More possibly in degree rather than in

3 1 tenets, or basic philosophy. But this Administration just
2 knows who its friends are and the people that are looking
3 in on this television show are not included in that circle,
4 an awful lot of them. It keeps its word with its friends, it
5 really does. I want to say for the Nixon Administration, it
6 does, it does keep its word to its friends.

7 MR. SIDEY: Who are its friends?

8 SENATOR HUMPHREY: The banks, the large banks that made
9 unprecedented profits in this Administration in 1969, '70
10 and '71. The corporate wealth of this country that got
11 a tax break of almost nine to 10 billion dollars in the
12 recent tax bill. This Administration takes care of its
13 friends. It even takes care of some of them, according
14 to what I have been reading lately, at least there is some
15 possibility, there is some allegation, in terms of mergers,
16 that even affect the Department of Justice.

17 MR. KIKER: Senator Humphrey, the big issue in the
18 Florida primary, and one of the big issues nationally today
19 is school busing.

20 SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, sir.

21 MR. KIKER: Some of the candidates in Florida have
22 made it perfectly clear how they stand. Mr. Wallace
23 is against it. Mr. Jackson is against it. Mr. Lindsay
24 is for it. How does Hubert Humphrey stand? Are you for it or
25 against it?

1 SENATOR HUMPHREY: My position has never changed. I am
2 opposed to massive compulsory busing that has as its sole
3 objective racial balance based on a mathematical formula. I
4 believe in integrated education, I am opposed to segregated education, I
5 think it is fit, right and proper that you bus a child from
6 an inferior school to a good school. I think it is
7 wrong and doesn't make a bit of sense to bus a child
8 from a good school to a poor school, and I think black
9 parents and white parents both feel the same. Busing
10 when it is used to improve the quality of education has
11 its justification. When it is used to settle every racial
12 problem in this country, it becomes divisive and it
13 doesn't help.

14 MR. KIKER: So you are for one-way busing?

15 SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, I am for education. I am
16 for improving the quality of education and I see
17 that busing can help that if it is used with plain ordinary
18 common sense, Mr. Kiker.

19 MR. KIKER: Are you against busing white children
20 from affluent, let's say upper middle class white
21 suburbs into black schools?

22 SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, I am not, not if the school is a
23 good school, but I am opposed to busing anybody from a good
24 school to a bad school, white or black. I think you justify
25 busing on what it does for education. I think the problem

1 of race relations in this country will be basically
2 settled when we open up our neighborhoods, when we
3 begin to practice real equal opportunity in corporate
4 business and in government and in education.

5 MR. KIKER: Well, I get back to a term that I obviously
6 have invented, that is one-way busing. You are for
7 busing, to get it down again, for busing children of both
8 colors from bad schools to good schools.

9 SENATOR HUMPHREY: Correct. I want to help education,
10 that is right.

11 MR. KIKER: You are against busing school children from
12 good schools to bad schools.

13 SENATOR HUMPHREY: Bad schools with poor teachers,
14 exactly.

15 MR. KIKER: It really comes down to black and white,
16 doesn't it?

17 SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, it doesn't. There are some very
18 fine schools, may I say, that are in black neighborhoods
19 with excellent teachers and good facilities. I just think
20 that the average American has an awful lot of sense
21 and they don't like to have their children bused long
22 distances simply to satisfy some kind of a mathematical
23 formula. By the way, my position on this hasn't changed
24 a bit. I just, before we came on this program, asked a
25

1 member of my staff to get my position, which is dated
2 in September, 1971, and here is what it says.

3 "Busing has its only justification if it improves
4 the quality of education and equality of educational opportunity

5 but we must view busing as only one method and certainly not
6 always the best solution for accomplishing the equitable
7 desegregation of school districts. Wherever possible we
8 should make full use of other methods," and by the way,
9 the blacks like that and the whites like it. Just
10 yesterday in the City of Miami, in Florida, I received the
11 unanimous endorsement of the largest black ministerial
12 association in the city, so I think we are on pretty
13 good ground.

14 MR. SPIVAK: May I ask you a question. Governor
15 Rubin Askew of Florida is risking his political
16 life by asking the citizens of Florida to vote against a
17 resolution which would prohibit forced busing. A first
18 amendment. Now what would you advise the people of Florida
19 to do on that first resolution, would you ask them to vote
20 for it or against it?

21 SENATOR HUMPHREY: I would ask them to listen to a fine,
22 courageous, decent Governor, and I have supported Rubin
23 Askew's position totally. I do not believe in the
24 Constitutional Amendment process and I think that Governor
25 Askew has -- well he has demonstrated the kind of political
leadership that is making many an American have new faith in

government and I support him totally and I am delighted to have the chance to say it on this program.

1 MR. BRODER: Senator, continuing on the same subject, you
2 say your position has not changed at all; you say you favor
3 a broad attack on the problem of school desegregation rather
4 than focusing on busing.

5 I am puzzled then why you voted, on February 29th of
6 this year, against Senator Ribicoff's amendment to require
7 desegregation of all metropolitan area schools in this
8 country in authorizing \$1 billion a year of federal funds to
9 support that effort.

10 SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, I consulted with what we call the
11 Civil Rights Leadership Conference. I thought possibly
12 they would have a pretty good idea as to whether or not this
13 was a good amendment because it involved not one billion of
14 dollars; it involved billions and billions of dollars and it
15 was a part of a program of amendments in the Congress that I
16 thought was rather confusing and I am happy to say that
17 Hubert Humphrey's votes in the Civil Rights Leadership
18 Conference were right on the same target. They advised me
19 and I took their advice.

20 MR. BRODER: That vote not only put you at odds with your
21 colleagues, Senator Mondale, Senator Hart, Senator Kennedy,
22 Senator Bayh, Muskie and McGovern, who I think most of us
23 would regard as pro-Civil Rights Senators; it also directly
24 reversed your own vote on that same amendment on April 21st of
25 1971.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Now, does that reversal have nothing to do with the Florida primary?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Not one bit because the issue was entirely different. In 1971 we were voting on the whole subject of desegregated education and I voted for it then. This time it was another one of the many amendments that was being brought in as to whether or not you were for a constitutional amendment and I am opposed to a constitutional amendment. I believe in total desegregation. There isn't the slightest doubt, I don't think I have to present my credentials. I have been at it for 25 years.

MR. SHEEHAN: Senator, you said earlier in response to a question from Mr. Spivak that you were in favor of new proposals for a new day in American life.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes.

MR. SHEEHAN: What is the most important new idea that you can give us for American life? What is the most important new proposal you have?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I would suggest that the time has arrived in our governmental structure when we need to take a good hard look at how we plan the better use of our resources. What should be our commitments; what should be our priorities; what should be our goals, and how can we mobilize the resources that we need to achieve a particular set of objectives. We have had no plans. We have got one budget each year. It is

1 the most secret document, by the way, of the government.
2 No one knows what is in it until -- except in the Executive
3 Branch, until it is presented to the Congress. I am proposing
4 a national growth and development policy in which the Congress
5 of the United States, in which state and local governments
6 and the executive branch of government can start to concen-
7 trate their attention on where we ought to go five years from
8 now, ten years from now. What kind of policy should we have
9 for energy, for communication, for transportation; how should
10 we direct our energies and our resources to environmental
11 protection; how will we rebuild our cities?

12 I submit that the Nixon Administration has no urban
13 policy, for example. I believe in planning, the proper use of
14 resources, the mobilization of them, learning from the space
15 program, might I add, what you can do if you make up your
16 mind to do it and set some targets and datelines.

17 MR. SIDEY: Senator, do you believe that Richard Nixon
18 is a total failure as President in his three years?

19 SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Sidey, I wouldn't make that
20 accusation because there are some things, of course, that the
21 President has done that I hope the American people will
22 applaud.

23 MR. SIDEY: What?

24 SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, he has withdrawn some troops from
25 Vietnam. For this I am grateful. He has made the visit to

1 Peking. I support that. I think that was a valuable initia-
2 tive. He is going to travel to Moscow. We will have to wait to
3 see what comes out of that.

4 He has made some legislative proposals which I think
5 surely merit what you call a pat on the back, an affirmative
6 response, such as his Welfare Reform Program, even though I
7 don't think it went nearly far enough. But I consider Mr.
8 Nixon's economic policies a colossal failure. I think that
9 those policies have worked an undue hardship upon this country,
10 and today, might I add, that the price control program of the
11 Nixon Administration is a hoax, a sham, a public relations
12 gimmick that is not protecting the average wage earner and the
13 working family of this country and is causing great hardship
14 to people on fixed incomes, and on that basis his adminsitra-
15 tion is a failure.

16 MR. SIDEY: You mentioned earlier that this Administration,
17 you believe, takes care of its friends.

18 SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes.

19 MR. SIDEY: Could you go a little further on that?
20 Do you believe the White House was implicated in this ITT
21 matter which is now being reviewed before the Congress?

22 SENATOR HUMPHREY: I don't know and I wouldn't want to
23 make that kind of an accusation. I simply say that this par-
24 ticular situation is another one of those examples that erodes
25 confidence in government, that causes suspicion and distrust

1 and it seems to me that it is something that ought to be
2 clarified promptly. There has to be some kind of an answer
3 to it. It is either true or it isn't true.

4 MR. SIDEY: What is your feeling about someone like
5 former Secretary of Commerce Stans going out to be chief
6 fund-raiser after dealing in his government capacity with major
7 corporations and businesses?

8 SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, he will surely know where the
9 money is and he will know who got the contracts and may I
10 say the GOP Newsletter is reminding all of those who have been
11 at the government table that they should make generous
12 contributions to the Republican National Committee.

13 MR. SPIVAK: We have less than three minutes.

14 MR. KIKER: Senator Humphrey, it is reported last week in
15 Florida you said if elected ten days later you would be
16 pulling troops out of Vietnam and, in response to a question
17 from Mr. Sheehan you said perhaps ninety days was too long
18 to get them all out. My question is this: If elected, would
19 you be willing to set a date certain?

20 SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, sir, I surely would.

21 MR. KIKER: Would that be predicated upon the release
22 of the prisoners of war?

23 SENATOR HUMPHREY: It would be predicated upon the
24 release of the prisoners of war. I do not think that any
25 man that is serving as President of the United States, Mr.

1 Kiker, can leave these men, the prisoners of war, rotting in
2 those prison camps in Hanoi and in North Vietnam. I don't
3 think the American people would stand for it and I think the
4 sooner we tell North Vietnam that we are prepared to withdraw
5 our forces, that we will set a date certain, but simultaneously
6 we will negotiate the release of the prisoners of war with the
7 help of the international community, the better.

8 MR. KIKER: Adjacent to the Vietnam issue, how do you
9 stand on amnesty?

10 SENATOR HUMPHREY: I do not favor unconditional amnesty.
11 I believe if those are to be repatriated that left this country
12 then they should perform some kind of compensatory civilian
13 service. I would like to bring us all back together. I'd like
14 to see people brought back to this country and be repatriated
15 but not without some service to country.

16 MR. SPIVAK: Senator, do you think President Nixon
17 ought to announce his position on forced busing before the
18 Florida primary?

19 SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, it would have been helpful, I
20 think, but I didn't expect him to. I hope he will make
21 a position, that's all.

22 MR. BRODER: Senator, one of your Florida rivals,
23 Senator Jackson, accused you today of grandstanding by promis-
24 ing to disclose your campaign finances at the last moment
25 before the election. How do you respond to that?

1 SENATOR HUMPHREY: I will disclose my campaign finances.
2 There is no requirement of law but I think there is a
3 requirement of conscience and I ask every Democrat to do it and
4 I also ask President Nixon's campaign organization to disclose
5 their finances. I'd like to take a look at that Republican
6 war chest. I'd just like to see how much is in it. I'd like
7 to see who contributed to it: I'd like to see how well Mr.
8 Stans is doing, how well Mr. Mitchell is doing. I'd like to
9 see how much of that corporate money is in there, or from
10 some of the leaders of the corporations. I will disclose.
11 Total disclosure.

12 MR. SPIVAK: We have only thirty seconds.

13 MR. SHEEHAN: Senator, in relation to the withdrawal of
14 our troops from Vietnam, are you also in favor of stopping
15 military aid to the Saigon government and the use of
16 American air power in Vietnam?

17 SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am. I think we have given them all
18 that they need, and an over-abundance.

19 MR. SPIVAK: Senator, that was a nice, brief answer. I
20 am sorry to interrupt. Our time is up.

21 Thank you, Senator Humphrey, for being with us today on
22 MEET THE PRESS.

23 (Next week: Governor George C. Wallace (D.) of Alabama.)
24
25



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