

000196

TRANSCRIPT OF "FACE THE NATION" MAY 28, 1972

Joint Appearance of Senators Hubert Humphrey and George McGovern

Moderator: CBS News Correspondent George Herman

CBS News Correspondent: David Schoumacher

National Political Correspondent: Washington Post, David S. Broder

## TRANSCRIPT OF "FACE THE NATION" MAY 28, 1972

MR. HERMAN: Senator Humphrey, Senator McGovern.

Good evening to you.

Gentlemen, President Nixon is about to return from Moscow with an arms agreement with indications of improved relations between Russian and mainland China. The economy has expanded rapidly. Food prices have fallen two consecutive terms. Viet Nam is deteriorating. Do either of you, under those circumstances believe you can beat President Nixon.

Senator Humphrey.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I believe so, if I didn't, I surely wouldn't be trying to seek this nomination. Of course he is beatable.

The economy is in disarray. The American people have great doubts about many of the policies of this administration, and I think ultimately the people are going to judge the next president of the United States on the basis of his record, his experience, his ability, his credibility, and I am confident that under those terms, I can win the nomination and I can win the presidency.

SENATOR McGOVERN: Well, I have no doubt that President Nixon can be defeated. I think the American people are looking for a new type of leadership. When I was a boy growing up in South Dakota, I remember at that time that every American, every person I know loved this country and was proud of it.

It wasn't that we thought our leadership was perfect, but we thought our Government was essentially worthy of our trust; that it was a good and decent land and it is that kind of a leadership and that kind of America that I want to restore again. I think that people are sick and tired of a war that never ends, which President Nixon has not ended. I think that they are tired of a tax system that favors the powerful and penalizes the rest of us. I think that they are tired of a leadership that tells us one thing in public while following a different course in private, and I believe that people of this country will respond to the kind of leadership that appeals to what is best in us. In Lincoln's phrase to the better angels of our nature and if we build that kind of a leadership and that kind of a country, and I am confident future generations in this country will love America not simply because they were born here but because of the kind of a great and good country we have made it. That is why I want to be President of the United States. That is why I think I am going to be nominated and elected.

MR. HERMAN: Senator Humphrey, in your drive for the presidential nomination in Miami Beach, is California a determining factor? Is it crucial to your struggle?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, of course, California is a very important state. It has 271 delegate votes, and that makes it very important. And whomever wins here, I think, has a very good head start.

But, it is not the beginning or the end. I intend to carry right on, and I intend to win here, and intend to win here because I believe I have the issues.

I have the experience as a mayor, as a senator, as a vice-president. I have the experience in congress, of accomplishment. The record, everything from Medicare to student loans, to nuclear test ban treaty, to an arms control agency, and I believe that Senator McGovern, while having a very catchy phrase where he says, "Right from the start with McGovern," or "McGovern right from the start," that there are many times that you will find that it was not right from the start, but wrong from the start.

We were both wrong on Viet Nam. Senator McGovern is wrong on Israel. Senator McGovern has been wrong on unemployment compensation. Senator McGovern has been wrong on labor law and on the two or three great issues here in California; on his massive unrealistic and I think rather outside welfare program, he is wrong. On taxation he is contradictory and inconsistent. He is wrong on defense cuts. I think they will cut into the muscle, in the very fiber of our national security.

So I believe that when people have a chance to weigh the issues, they will find out that there are differences, and that those differences will add up into a nomination.

SENATOR MCGOVERN: Could I comment on the senator's analysis, since my record was very heavily involved in this opening statement.

I find it almost impossible to believe that the senator from Minnesota would attack my record on Viet Nam.

Here is a senator, George McGovern, who has spoken out against that war more consistently, and over a longer period of time than any other person in the United States Senate. And I think it's fair to say that Senator Humphrey, during all the time that he was vice-president of this country, and was making statements on Viet Nam, and even when he became the standard bearer of our party in 1968, no one could have been any more enthusiastic for the course that we were following in Viet Nam.

Let me just cite one quote, and I am not going to belabor that record, but as late as October 1967, several years after I had referred to Viet Nam as the worst moral and political disaster in our history, Senator Humphrey was saying Viet Nam is our greatest adventure and a wonderful one it is.

SENATOR McGOVERN: This is not a record that encourages me to believe that the Senator's experience during that period as Vice President is one that commends him to take us out of Vietnam and prevent future catastrophies of that kind. As to my position on Israel, I see no essential difference between the views that I felt and the view that Senator Humphrey holds. I believe we have to do whatever is necessary to secure the defense of Israel, to provide ~~the~~ arms, to provide the aircraft that they have requested and there has never been any hesitance on my part about that. As we move along, I will comment on welfare and taxation and defense but let me say for my part I am not satisfied about what we are doing in any of those fields now. I think we can do better. I don't like this welfare mess that we are operating under today. I don't like a tax structure that favors the rich and the powerful and penalizes the workingman, and I don't like an 80 million dollar military budget with all this overkill, waste and theft that adds nothing to the security of our country but, as President Eisenhower warned us, actually weakens the country by depriving us of our resources that we need elsewhere in our natural life.

MR. BRODER: Let's stay on this one point of Vietnam for a moment. Why should you ask the Democratic voters of California to take you on that issue rather than Senator McGovern?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: What I said, Senator McGovern right from the start, the fact that Senator McGovern was not right from the start no more than I was. We both voted

the same way in the United States Senate. That is where we started. The fact is, that all through the Senator's career he voted for the appropriations for the war in Vietnam. There is no doubt he spoke out against it but he voted for it. That is the record. And when it comes to unemployment compensation, he did not vote to support it. He voted against it. When it comes to labor legislation, he voted against it. When it comes to certain other aspects such as in welfare legislation, he calls it a horrible mess. Let me say a \$72 billion welfare proposal that Senator McGovern makes today is not only a horrible mess, it would be an unbelievable burden upon the taxpayers. And when you come to a tax program that, on the one hand, the Senator will say to the public, "Look, we have got to get the money from the rich," and on the other hand he will run an ad in the Wall Street Journal that says, "Well, don't believe it. Don't believe it." Here is a letter in the Wall Street Journal, right here, a letter to a brokerage firm that says, "Now don't worry. I am not proposing. I have not suggested the elimination of tax exemption for bonds. I have not suggested the elimination of capital gains limitations." You can't have it both ways.

MR. HERMAN: Senator, I am sure in the course of the hour we are going to get into many of these other topics. Let me try to stay on the specific that you mentioned on Vietnam.

Why do you feel that your record on that specific issue commends you to the voters of California more than Senator McGovern's record?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I don't say it commends me more, but I say that on every single vote since I have returned to the Senate, we have voted alike on Vietnam. Secondly, I say in 1968 when I was a candidate for the Presidency, I was the only man that recommended the systematic troop withdrawal of our forces from Vietnam. I say both of us were wrong in the beginning. I don't think we ought to have a slogan that says "Right from the start," when both have voted exactly the same way, unless you want to say we were both right from the start.

MR. BRODER: Senator McGovern, you've been critical of Senator Humphrey as a Vice-President for not speaking out. Can we from that assume that if you should be elected President you're going to permit your Vice-President to disagree with you on all issues, or are you going to ask him to resign if he doesn't agree with you?

SENATOR MCGOVERN: Well I certainly would not expect him to speak out with the kind of exuberance about a policy that he thought was wrong that was demonstrated in this quote I just read. I cannot conceive of a Vice President who had any doubts at all about our military course in Vietnam as late as 1967 describing it as a wonderful adventure, one of our greatest adventures, and a wonderful one it is. That is not the language of a man who has the kind of deep-seated opposition to our involvement in Vietnam that I have had for many years. I want to say to my friend, Senator Humphrey, that I have heard him state on many a platform that George McGovern was the one Senator who was right on Vietnam, all during these years when he

000204

and others were wrong, and I am somewhat amazed to come into the final days of this campaign -- I realize the pressures we are under and, have the Senator say that our records have been parallel.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: That is not what I said at all. I said right from the start and, let's get it straight, that right from the start we voted alike and, may I point out there is no doubt the Senator has spoken against Vietnam, but with equal candor, I must say the speech is one thing but the vote is another. As late as 1969 Senator McGovern did vote for supplementary appropriations to conduct the war in Vietnam. He voted against the repeal of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. Now those are the facts.

MR. SCHOUMACHER: I think that the voters are probably more interested in Senator McGovern. Do you see any difference in the policy that you and Senator Humphrey would carry out on Vietnam, if either of you were elected President?

SENATOR MCGOVERN: What I see is one Senator who has been in opposition to this war ever since 1963 and another Senator who supported it.

MR. HERMAN: It is something that the Republicans have raised and I am sure they are going to raise again. That is the interview that you had with the New York Times in 1965.

When you said support President Johnson's conduct of the war, you support the strafing of Vietnam he was carrying out. I am sure that is going to come up again.

SENATOR McGOVERN: The point of that is President Johnson at that time was being urged to undertake the massive bombardment of North Vietnam and what I was trying to do was support the President's refusal to enter into that type of bombardment at that stage in the war he was limiting the attacks to a single retaliation each time there was a major attack on an American installation, but let's --

MR. HERMAN: When our forces are attacked, if I may quote you? I agree that when our forces....

SENATOR McGOVERN: This was after the bombing of the Pleiku barracks and the President responded with the limited response but there was no indication of the kind of sustained and heavy bombardment that was later to begin, but there is something that has to be clarified here in the records, and I think that Senator Humphrey, with his sense of fairness, will agree that there is a difference. When a Senator speaks out against Vietnam as I did all during the 1960's, but, is confronted with a situation where he has to vote for the military budget of the United States in which Vietnam appropriations are included. He does not have the option of saying, "I am against the Vietnam portion so I am going to vote no on that and vote yes on the rest of the defence budget." You have the choice of either saying I am against the entire defense budget of the United States and I vote for zero appropriations or you get up and speak against the war. You try to change the policy and then you do as I did on the floor of the United States Senate and explain that your vote for the defense budget is not

entitled to be interpreted as a vote for the Vietnam war.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: That didn't bother Senator McGovern when it came on the vote to aid to Israel. He voted against the Foreign Aid appropriation because he didn't like what was in it about Laos. He voted earlier to put money in for Israel and, but on the end, he votes no. You can't have it both ways. That is what I am trying to say. And in 1969 there was a supplemental appropriation which was related directly to funds for Southeast Asia and I asked the Senator in all honesty, between two compatriots from the Senate, did or did he not vote for it. The answer was he did vote for it.

SENATOR MCGOVERN: But explaining very carefully that even that appropriation included food for our soldiers, included medical care for our soldiers, included housing for our soldiers.

There was no way those things could be singled out. If the senator will check the record, he will see it precisely the time that I was supporting that overall appropriation. I said it was wrong to have American soldiers in Viet Nam, that they ought to be taken out, but as long as they were there, I was going to see that they were supplied with the equipment that they needed. That is vastly different for a senator to be warning against the involvement of American forces, calling it a disaster, calling for an end, and the position that my friend Senator Humphrey took all during that period when he said this is a glorious adventure.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: That isn't what was said at all.

MR. SCHOUMACHER: Could we go on to another area, now. One of the things that you brought up here, Senator Humphrey, was the government's proposal on defense spending. You have indicated that you believe his 55, 58 billion dollar defense budget is playing games with national security, and yet, as you know, you did write a column at one time in a Washington newspaper saying that you thought we can cut the pentagon budget to as low as fifty billion dollars a year, and still have real security for the United States. Why was your fifty billion dollars a year not jeopardizing security and his 58 billion dollars is?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Because in 1970, when I wrote that, I had predicated it on, as the column will reveal, on being out of Viet Nam, looking to the future; being out of Viet Nam which, at that time, would have been a savings of 16 billion dollars of cutting waste. And the senate and the congress cut out 6 billion dollars, so that was a 22 billion dollar cut put out of a 72 billion dollar request, getting it down to a 50 billion dollar figure.

Now I say I think that was a pretty good estimate of what we could do. But, there is a lot of difference between the numbers there than getting in and cutting your fleet in half, which is exactly what Senator McGovern recommends, cutting your Air Force by two thirds, cutting your Marine Corps down to two token divisions, cutting down your naval squadrons by 80%. And building no new ships, or no new modernization units. I submit that the

000208

McGovern defense proposal cuts into the very muscle of our defense. It isn't just cutting into the waste. It isn't just cutting into manpower. It's cutting into the very security of this country without any regard as to what kind of negotiations you can make with the Soviet Union;

MR. SCHOUMACHER: What specific cuts you said you were in favor of cutting? Fat and what specific cuts, and how many dollars would you save today on a defense budget?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: It's estimated by the Brookings Institution, itself in its most recent report, that we can take approximately ten billion dollars off the defense budget in manpower, and in what they call inprocurement improvement, and still maintain the kind of defense that we really need. And that doesn't mean that you cut your carrier forces from 15 to 6 as Senator McGovern is proposing. I think there is a chance to reduce the defense budget. We did it last year in the congress, we did it the year before, and the defense analysis made by the Brookings Institution says about 10 billion dollars.

MR. BRODER: Senator McGovern, Senator Humphrey, on this topic, has said if your unilateral cuts had gone into effect, there would have been no incentive for the Russians to enter into a salt agreement as they did this week. No such agreement would have occurred.

How would you respond to that?

SENATOR MCGOVERN: Well, in the first place, I disagree with the senator's analysis that if we had reduced military spending, we would not have been able to negotiate

an arms reduction with the Soviet Union. And I would think that he would agree with that, when you consider the full context in which he was recommending substantial cuts in military spending in this country as late as February 9, 1970.

Now, I want to read the full text of what the senator said, because I have the column before me, and it's not some hastily devised statement. It was a syndicated column that the senator wrote appearing in the Washington Daily News on February 9, 1970.

MR. BRODER: Couldn't you extract it for us? It's quite long.

SENATOR MCGOVERN: Yes. I am not going to read the whole column. I am going to read two sentences from it which give the gist of it, which says Senator Humphrey is speaking now, "I do not think we can continue to spend 70 to 80 billion dollars a year on weapon systems and a huge defense establishment while paying only lip service to the real needs of this nation."

And then he says, "We can cut the Pentagon budget as low as 50 billion dollars a year and still have real security for the United States."

Now, that is a 5 billion dollar greater cut than I have proposed, and I think the McGovern budget and McGovern alternative budget, which comes out to just under 55 billion dollars will give this country all the military power we need. It would still leave us the capacity to destroy every city in the Soviet Union at least 20 times

000210

over. I think that is just about enough.

It actually increases our submarine fleet. It improves the mobility of our forces.

MR. BRODER: Can we increase our submarine fleet on the basis of the agreement signed in Moscow where we are limited to the numbers.

SENATOR McGOVERN: We can increase the attack submarines. We cannot increase the Polaris and the Poseidon System under the Moscow agreement. But where we are falling behind is on the attack submarine, that is our answer to the increase in the Soviet surface fleet.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Let's get on this one minute.

First, my figures were at 1970 prices, and the price of inflation and military weaponry has gone up fantastically ever since and everybody knows it. You don't even need to argue the point. That is No. 1.

Secondly, that was a part of a series of articles in which I was recommending no ABM's, and the total cost of the projected ABM System in that 72 billion dollar budget was 12 billion dollars. Now, that was not needed, because even the ABM today, with two ABM sites, is the freeze with the Soviet Union.

Thirdly, the Viet Nam war and the series of articles, I was calling for its end, and the end of the appropriations; and fourthly, I was calling for a sharp reduction in the waste and cutting out the waste in the defense budget.

Now, that is a fact.

Now, what Senator McGovern has proposed, are specifics. He says, halt the Minute Man procurement, halt the Poseidon procurement. Halt the B-1 Prototype. Phase out 230 of our 530 strategic bombers. Reduce aircraft carrier force from 15 to 6. Reduce our naval air squadrons to 80%. Halt all naval surface shipbuilding. Reduce the number of cruisers from 230 to 130. Reduce the number of submarines by 11.

Now, when you get down to that, and reduce the total number of forces, 66,000 below what we had pre-Pearl Harbor, you are not talking about just removing waste, or just doing something that seems to be kind of comfortable for the country. You are cutting in to the very fiber and the muscle of the defense establishment, and there can be no doubt about it.

MR. BRODER: Senator, what is the military threat that you see that we have to spend 70 or 80 billion dollars on?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I didn't say we had to spend 70 or 80 billion dollars. Everything has to be relative and I believe in negotiated arms control and negotiated disarmament. I do not believe in a unilateral troop reduction, for example in Western Europe of a hundred fifty thousand, which Senator McGovern has proposed. I believe we ought to negotiate that out with the Russians just like we have negotiated out the ABM freeze, and just like we have negotiated in interim agreement on offensive weapons. You cannot negotiate with the Russians from a position of

weakness; if we haven't learned that, we learned nothing.

MR. SCHOUMACHER: Senator, I think the basis of what Mr. Broder was asking you, is do you think the Russians still, today, are seeking to dominate the world, and would like to knock out the United States? Is that the threat on which we have to base all our policy?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Not a bit, but I think we have to recognize that the Soviet Union is perfectly capable of engaging in gunboat diplomacy. I wonder what you would think if we had a fleet half the size in the Mediterranean?

MR. SCHOUMACHER: I think that was a remarkable statement. You don't think that the Soviet Union is now seeking to dominate...

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I didn't say that. I said they are perfectly capable of engaging in gunboat diplomacy where they will use their power as a fact, and say this is the way it is.

For example, in the Mediterranean, the only protection that we have in the southern flank of NATO, in the Mediterranean today, is the Sixth Fleet.

Now, if you start cutting the Sixth Fleet with the Soviet buildup to its fleet in the Mediterranean, one of these days, the Soviet Union is going to present you with a fact accomplished, so to speak, a fait accompli, in which it says, listen, we are in North Africa. We are going to stay in North Africa. We have our bases in North Africa. They can overrun Israel in the Middle East. The only protection which Israel has in that part of the world right

now is the presence of the American Sixth Fleet, as its counterbalance of power of the Soviet Union. I think Americans are sensible enough to know that while the Russians may not want to precipitate World War III, they surely know what they call the pressure game in politics, the gunboat diplomacy of the 20th century. I'm not about ready to let the Russians make America into a second-class power, nor am I going to let Senator McGovern's defense proposals make America into a second-class power. I don't think this would be right.

MR. SCHOUMACHER: Can you address yourself to my question? How do you estimate the Soviet intention at this point?

SENATOR McGOVERN: May I comment on what the Senator has said here? After all, I have known something about war firsthand. I know where we were at the beginning of World War II. I know that it's a mistake to ever again permit this country to become as weak as we were in the late 1930's. I saw a good many of my friends die right in front of my eyes because we weren't adequately defended. But, a 55 billion dollar budget of the kind I have proposed here is a budget fully adequate to the defense needs of this country. It doesn't leave us defenseless before the Soviet Union. It still gives us a bigger and better bomber fleet than they have. It gives us better **and more accurate missiles** than they have. It gives us a better submarine fleet, both a Polaris and Poseidon, than they have, while we are reducing forces in Western Europe. There is nothing to prevent the

000214

European economies from making up any difference that they think might be needed in Western Europe. Why should the American taxpayer, 27 years after the end of World War II, maintain 500,000 Americans on the ground in Western Europe when the European economies are perfectly capable of providing more of their own military manpower?

I don't think it is just an accident that some of the top defense experts in this country have issued a statement saying that this military budget of mine is sound; that it's reasonable. And they are asking for some reasonable alternative from Senator Humphrey that we haven't yet heard.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: May I suggest it is not a 500,000 --

MR. HERMAN: We will come back, but gentlemen let me interrupt here. We will return shortly with the second half of this special edition of Face The Nation.

(Break for Commercial.)

MR. HERMAN: Senator Humphrey, from the opening seconds you have made a reference a number of times to the 72 billion dollar cost of Governor -- Senator -- Senator McGovern's welfare proposal. How do you arrive at that 72 billion dollar figure?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: By a Senate Finance Committee Staff study of the United States Senate, it's an estimated 72 billion dollars cost with 104 million Americans on welfare.

SENATOR McGOVERN: Could I clarify that point?

000215

Senator Humphrey knows, there is an old practice in the Senate of introducing bills on request, even when a Senator may not, himself, support that legislation, in order to get the matter before the Senate for debate.

Now, the bill that he is talking about is the National Welfare Rights Organization Bill, sponsored by that organization. It was a bill which was introduced, on request, for the first time two years ago by Senator McCarthy of Minnesota, who was then a member of the Finance Committee.

The organization came to me after Senator McCarthy left the Senate, and said there was no one that they could get to introduce the bill. I told them there was no chance to get a measure through the Senate that would require a payment of \$6500 to a family of four, but I would introduce the bill so that at least it would have a hearing. I did that.

I explained it on the Senate floor at the time that it was not my proposal. It was very clear that this was a proposal simply to get it before the Senate for debate.

The proposals that I have made have nothing to do with that specific proposal of the Welfare Rights Organization.

MR. SCHOUMACHER: As you know, reporters covering you have been trying for quite some time to get a price tag on your welfare bill. Yesterday there was even a special session for us and we heard numbers from 20 to 30

000216

to 60 billion dollars. Can you tell us today how much it will cost?

SENATOR McGOVERN: There is no way, Mr. Schoumacher, that you can make an exact estimate on this proposal, because what I have said, No. 1, is that I want to get rid of the present program entirely. I want to scrap the existing welfare mess.

MR. SCHOUMACHER: But, you are asking us to accept a program that you can't tell us how much it's going to cost.

SENATOR McGOVERN: That is exactly right. There is no way to estimate the cost of this program other than to say there is no net cost to the Treasury at all. It's an effort to require a higher tax bracket for the very rich and the powerful, and to provide greater support for those at the low end of the income scale. But let me put it to you this way, every American who is earning \$12,000 a year or less would profit from the proposal that I have suggested; above that figure, up to an income of twenty thousand, it might cost him another twenty-one dollars a year in taxes to support this program.

After you get above \$25,000, the tax bite would be somewhat higher, but you would be financing a minimum income program that would work, rather than the mess that we have now that won't work.

MR. SCHOUMACHER: But, you are saying it won't cost the Treasury anything. It may cost those of us on this panel and the people at home something. How much is it going to cost?

SENATOR McGOVERN: It might <sup>000217</sup> cost the people on this panel twenty-five or thirty dollars a year in additional income. To the average American, it represents a net gain, everybody up to \$12,000 would be better off under the proposal that I have suggested. Above that level, there would be a small increase in taxes, but nothing that would work a hardship on anyone.

But, gentlemen, let me put it this way. It's impossible to devise a welfare system that is worse than the one we have got now. It's not working.

MR. SCHOUMACHER: I am still stuck on this figure of this amount, and I want to go back to Senator Humphrey and say it is true, Senator, that you are using freely in every speech a 72 billion dollar figure; which does not apply to the program which is what Senator McGovern is currently advocating.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I said this and I am being very careful. There is a bill which the Senator introduced, which does not say "at request" which is what a bill does when you put it at request in the Senate. It is Senate Bill S2372, and that bill, according to the Senate Finance Committee, stated, and I read that the persons eligible in fiscal 1973 would be 104 million at the cost of 72 billion dollars, increasing for the fiscal year 1977 to 114 million persons at a cost of 80 billion dollars.

Now, that is what the -- you talk about a welfare mess, gentlemen, that is not only a welfare mess, that is a compounded mess. And when you start to talk about

72 billions of dollars, somebody has got to pay that bill.

MR. BRODER: Senators, specifically what changes would you make in today's welfare?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Let me come to it, let me go to the next one. The Senator has an option and that is kind of an income **redistribution** proposal where everybody gets a thousand dollars. Everybody, rich or poor, whether it is Howard Hughes or whether it is Joe Smith, he gets a thousand dollars and it is on that one where he says that the tax bite really hits the person at \$12,000 a year or more. I took a look at it right here in California. A secretary working in San Francisco making \$8,000, a single person, and there are thousands, millions of single people in this country, would have an increase in his or her taxes, under Senator McGovern's welfare proposal, of \$567.

SENATOR McGOVERN: That is simply not true.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: It is true. A family that makes \$12,000, a family of four would have a \$409-increase.

SENATOR McGOVERN: That is not true.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: The Senator says it is not true. He doesn't know what the price tag to his bill is.

MR. BRODER: Where did you get the figures, if he doesn't know what his program costs, how do you know what his program costs?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: May I say I know what the tax rate is, what his proposed tax rate is because he has a surcharge tax rate. All it says is, that if you take a thousand dollars per person and there are 210 million

people in this country, it is a 210 billion dollar Treasury transaction.

MR. BRODER: I think these numbers are going to be impossible to resolve.

Will you tell me what, specifically, you are going to propose to change this welfare mess?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes. I have specifics. No. 1, raise Social Security pensions 25 per cent. That is where we start.

No. 2, have a minimum income for a family of 4 of \$3,000, not \$6,500.

SENATOR McGOVERN: I am proposing four thousand.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I suggest that also, besides that, that you take those persons that are what we call on Old Age Assistance, the blind, deaf, handicapped, those to be transferred to the Federal Welfare System and that will relieve the State and local Governments considerably, and then you take the Family Assistance Program and, over a period of four years, you make a slow transaction from the four-year period, from the States to the Federal Government. This will relieve, this will cost approximately 11 and a half billions of dollars as compared to whatever figure Senator McGovern wants to put on his elusive program of 72 billion.

MR. HERMAN: Senator Humphrey, one of the things that bothers people, the whole bureaucratic red tape that surrounds us, I don't see anything in there that will essentially change the nature of the welfare system.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes. First of all, you will have work requirements. Senator McGovern's program is share-the-wealth program, but not share-the-work. There are no work requirements in his program at all. I think that you ought to have training for people. I think you ought to have public service employment for people. I think you ought to try to provide jobs for people. I think you ought to have standards. I think those that are in need should have adequate income and those that are capable of work, that want to work, that can work, they should be trained for jobs and there should be jobs available to them. If not in a private sector, in the public sector. The minute a person is on the job, he starts to pay taxes. He starts to pay his share of the bills.

You have a program here that, with 104 million people covered under the program that he introduced, by request, which says there is no work requirement, you have a program on the second program that everybody gets a thousand dollars per person and no work requirement. I just don't think it makes very much sense. I don't think the Congress would pass it. I don't think the American people will buy it.

MR. HERMAN: You are champing at the bit to answer. We are champing at the bit to change the subject. Let's do both.

SENATOR McGOVERN: I want to say the Senator is making a very good case against the Bill that I made when I introduced it and said I was doing it on request, that it was not a piece of legislation that I thought would be approved by the Senate, that I did think this group had a right to have a hearing. Now, the Senator talks about the present program being in a mess, but I don't see anything in the proposals he suggested here that is going to straighten it out. What I want to make clear is that even if we were to take the suggestion I have made of a minimum income supplement of a thousand dollars a person, that would mean for a family of four, an income of \$4,000. Now, we have provided that you don't lose that. When you go to work there is no penalty for working. Under the present welfare system, if you get above a certain level, you are knocked off welfare and it is a discouragement to people to go to work. The program that I have suggested here today and that I suggested repeatedly all across this country would give the major benefits to working people. Most of this income transfer would go to people in an income between four thousand and twelve thousand dollars a year.

MR. HERMAN: Let me ask both of you a question, which I think fascinates everybody, like the three of us on the panel, who covers the political scene. The man who has won

000222

the most primaries, the man who has the biggest popular vote at this moment is George Wallace. What does it mean? What is the message he is sending the country?

Let's start with Senator McGovern, who I interrupted.

SENATOR MCGOVERN: I think one of the concerns that Governor Wallace has touched is the same one that I have, and I think it is one of the reasons that it is being reported, that many people who have responded to Governor Wallace have also looked kindly on some of the things I have been saying. That is, he speaks to the issue of tax injustice in this country. He properly points out --

MR. HERMAN: Is that the whole thing?

SENATOR MCGOVERN: I think that is part of it. I think there are other aspects in the Wallace appeal.

MR. HERMAN: How about his attitude toward the war, for example?

SENATOR MCGOVERN: His attitude on the war is directly opposite from mine.

MR. HERMAN: Yet he has gotten an enormous vote.

SENATOR MCGOVERN: He has gotten an enormous vote, in my judgment, to a great extent because he has come across as the champion of the little man. He said that time has come for the ordinary people of this country to get a better break and I believe that. I disagree with Governor Wallace's solution. I have proposed a fundamental tax reform program in this country that will be fair to the little person and will be fair to everybody.

MR. HERMAN: Let me get to Senator Humphrey, to his reaction as to why the Wallace phenomena is such a

big thing in this country.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: One thing for sure is it is not a phenomenon based upon putting everybody on welfare. You can start with that. It surely is not, that he has spoken against it. Another thing for sure, it is not a phenomenon that is based upon having the Government in everything. That is exactly what Senator McGovern's proposal --

MR. BRODER: Is it a phenomenon that in 1968 you called hate and racism --

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Let me continue here. I want to go back to this welfare business. We are talking about the fiscal responsibility of this country. This is the important part of the entire debate in this country today. Do the American people want to have a welfare program that does not put an emphasis on jobs, but puts an emphasis upon a handout that costs 72 billion dollars or do they want one that costs 210 billion dollars? That is what Senator McGovern is proposing and I submit he has no evidence that he can finance either one and I submit that the middle income tax payer will pay the lion's share of the bill. The Senate Finance Committee Study says that even under the best of circumstances, if you took all of the corporate profits, if you close all of the tax loopholes that Senator McGovern talks about -- by the way, I have the specific tax loophole closing program -- that you'd still be 51 billion dollars short. How are you going to do that?

MR. HERMAN: Now that's a good question about the Wallace phenomenon. You told us a couple of things of what it is not. Do you know what it is, what it stands for?

MR. HUMPHREY: Yes. I think it represents a kind of protest as to the insensitivity of the Government to people's needs, the remoteness of Government from the actual realities of life, of the working people of this country. I think it is an effort on the part of people or reaction on the part of people of a protest toward many things as they are, and many of the things that Governor Wallace has been talking about, are the very things that I have been leaning on for years, tax reform.

I was in the tax loophole closing business before Governor Wallace or Senator McGovern talked about it, much less did anything about it. I have been in the battle for the working families of this country on minimum wages, fair labor standards, on Medicare. For example, I led the fight on Medicare when the medical lobby of this country was fighting against me like it was a plague. I think I know that there are people in this country that want Government to be a little more sensitive to their needs.

MR. BRODER: The last place you went head-on with Wallace were Maryland and Michigan. He talked about busing there. Are you prepared to do anything to satisfy the obvious demands of his constituents to stop busing in this country?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I have a position on busing which I think is sound and sensible. I do not support massive compulsory busing that has as its primary and sole objective

racial balance on a quota basis. I do feel busing is one of the tools and only one that can be helpful in promoting better education, offering an opportunity for a child to go from a poor school to a good school to get a good education to promote integrated education.

MR. BRODER: If you were President, would you do anything to delay or prevent Court ordered school desegregation plans involving busing?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I would permit appeals but I surely would have the good sense to support the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States and not try to interfere with what I call the separation of powers.

MR. BRODER. Appeals are permitted under our system, but the answer is you would do nothing?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: President Nixon would like to stop those appeals.

MR. BRODER: You would do nothing to interfere with the course of action on decisions involving busing, would you?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, I would not.

MR. BRODER: Would you, Senator McGovern?

SENATOR MCGOVERN: I can only say this. I have been consistent in my support of the Supreme Court's decision and at no point have I read into that decision any order for massive busing in order to achieve racial balance. That was not the purpose of the decision.

MR. BRODER: You said at one point you thought busing was about 92nd in importance as an issue. Do you

000226

still think that after the primaries?

SENATOR McGOVERN: I think that is where it should be, in terms of the real needs of this country. I said it with tongue and cheek at the time, as you know Mr. Broder. What I was trying to get across to the people, is that it's an issue that has been emotionalized by the President and others, that have blown it out of all proportions to its real significance. When you look at what the Supreme Court said - it said that busing is one tool that we can use to achieve greater quality of education in the schools. In all due respects to my friend, Senator Humphrey, when President Nixon called for a moratorium on busing in effect, for a moratorium on the Supreme Court decision, the Senator said he was glad that the President finally had gotten his finger high enough in the air to see where the currents were blowing and to come over to the position that he had held all along. I think that actually was a departure from any real respect for the Supreme Court or support for this decision.

MR. SCHOUMACHER: Can I ask a question of both of you gentlemen? You have gone through California and through the campaign promising programs - that if you believe each others' estimates come to between two hundred to three hundred billion dollars, more openings on the Cabinet and Supreme Court than there will be in several administrations. Do you really think that is the way you get elected today?

SENATOR McGOVERN: Mr. Schoumacher, I have proposed nothing in the way of welfare reform or defense reform or

full employment or anything else without providing a method for financing it. As a matter of fact, if you total up all of the things that I have recommended in the course of this campaign, they come to about four billion dollars less than the additional revenues that I have proposed. The reason it is difficult to answer the question about the cost of the welfare reform proposal I suggest is that it depends on the Congress approving fundamental tax reform. I would never press for any program on welfare reform or any other place where I did not also have a tax reform proposal able to cover it. That is why I think the national taxpayers league a year ago said that Senator Proxmire of Wisconsin and Senator McGovern of South Dakota had the two best records on fiscal integrity of anyone in the Senate.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: May I suggest Senator Proxmire said just recently he considered Senator McGovern's tax proposals his Achille's heel, and also they would drive away any possible incentive of the American enterprise system. That's in his interview in the Milwaukee Journal.

SENATOR MCGOVERN: Isn't it strange Senator, that Senator Proxmire endorsed my candidacy for the Presidency?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, and he also said that he had a very difficult time explaining it to people - why he did it, in light of your tax program. Now I am just talking about the tax program. That's a fair and accurate statement.

MR. HERMAN: Would you be so able to support Senator McGovern if he gets the nomination?

MR. HUMPHREY: Over Mr. Nixon? Of course I will.

In the meantime, I will talk to Senator McGovern and get him off of some of these kicks he is on on the welfare program.

MR. HERMAN: Can you win do you think, and I am going to ask you both the same question. Can you win, Senator McGovern's particular constituency and, that is the young people, the anti-war people? Can you win them over? A great many of them, as you know, don't like you because of some past history. Do you think you can win them?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think I can win a great number of young people. Every young person is not in college. Only two out of seven are. I have a good number of the working people of America that don't really have the time just to run around and knock on doors. There are young men and women working in the supermarkets, in filling stations.

MR. HERMAN: But you are both democrats. Can you win the McGovern people?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think a democrat, myself included, will have the majority of the young people on his side and I will have the working families. That is the backbone of the democratic party, the working families of America.

MR. HERMAN: If you were the nominee Senator Humphrey, you would not accept help from Senator McGovern?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Of course I will. I will not only accept help from him, I will expect it, as Senator McGovern would expect it from me.

MR. HERMAN: Let me ask Senator McGovern, can you win the people in the democratic party who are devoted and convinced Hubert Humphrey followers and who have not rallied to your side, who have voiced a good deal of opposition.

SENATOR MCGOVERN: I have no doubt about it and I think the more my positions becomes known to the people of this country, the more support they are going to get. The Senator has talked here today a great deal about his friendship for the working people of this country. The fact remains that I am the candidate that has outlined a program to provide a job for every worker in this country and I have said where the money is going to come from. I have pointed out where we are going to get additional revenues, by closing some of the tax loopholes. I have pointed out where waste can be reduced in the military establishments, and then that money invested in job creating enterprises. I think that is what the rank and file of the working people in this country want.

MR. HERMAN: Gentlemen, you have both expressed an interest in having a little time for summary. I propose you give a final summary. Since we started with Senator Humphrey, we will begin with Senator McGovern.

SENATOR MCGOVERN: I have sought in recent months, as best I could, to point the direction in which I think the democratic party and this nation ought to be moving. I think the overwhelming majority of the American people are dissatisfied with the leadership of both parties. As a matter of fact, it's a leadership that no longer listens to

the American people. It is a leadership that has consistently told us one thing in public while advocating a different course in private. I think people are tired of these back-room deals. I think they are tired of politics as usual. It is my conviction they don't want another rerun in 1972 of 1968. I think there is a tide running in this country that provides the motive force of the McGovern campaign and it is a tide, above all else, would restore some measure of truthfulness and openness in the councils of government. It is a tide that would not only end the folly of Viet Nam, but would resolve that never again will we commit American forces trying to prop up a corrupt and unrepresentative military dictator abroad. I want to be able to proclaim some day soon "Peace has come." I want to be able to proclaim there is a decent job for every American. I want to be able to lead this country back to the reverence for life and liberty and pursuit of happiness with which we began. I want to preside over the kind of a country where we have what is most important of all, and that is the assurance we care very deeply about each other.

MR. HERMAN: You have the same amount of time.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I want to be your President because I believe in this country. I have said quite honestly that I have a love affair with America. I know its people. I know its heritage. I know its problems and I think I understand its hopes and its dreams and I want, above all, to lift the spirit of this country. I come to this quest for the Presidency with a record, a record that I am willing to lay on the table before the American jury and

to be judged by it. I have experience as a Mayor of a great city and this is an urbanite society and I think that is a difference between myself and Senator McGovern. I have been a United States Senator and leader in the Senate and I have a record of accomplishment for Medicare, to student loans, to pollution control, to the Peace Corps, to the Job Corps for the needy people, to the national defense education act, a host of measures that are there in this public law. More than that, I see that the measure of man's vision and leadership is not so much what he says but what he does and what he does, even when it is not popular. I don't believe that the American people are going to respond to who gives the most promises. I think they are going to look and see who gave the best performance. Now I have heard today Senator McGovern talk about his proposals for jobs. I submit most candidly that most of it includes unemployment compensation. I have heard his proposals for tax reform, yet, quite frankly, he has put the tax revenues he is going to save in three or four different places at the same time. I think the people want credibility. I think they want a sense of integrity. Above all, they will want a sense of vision for this country. They want a President not only that understands what people say, but what is in their hearts, who've suffered with them, who has grown with

them. I believe I can offer that kind of a record and that kind of leadership.

MR HERMAN: Thank you very much, Senator Humphrey, and thank you, Senator McGovern. I am sorry, gentlemen. Our time is now up. Thank you very much for being here today, to Face The Nation.

(opening debate)

OPENING STATEMENT

000183

THE ISSUE IN THIS CAMPAIGN IS WHO IS  
BETTER QUALIFIED TO LEAD THIS COUNTRY. TO MAKE  
THAT DECISION, THE PEOPLE MUST WEIGH OUR  
RESPECTIVE EXPERIENCE AND HOW WE STAND ON THE  
BASIC ISSUES.

MY PUBLIC LIFE HAS PROVEN A COMMITMENT  
TO PEOPLE -- A RECORD OF ACCOMPLISHMENT AND

Record

-2-

EXPERIENCE AS MAYOR, SENATOR, AND VICE PRESIDENT --  
HELP TO  
~~WHICH~~ WHICH QUALIFY ME FOR PRESIDENT.

SENATOR MCGOVERN HAS RUN AN EXPENSIVE  
MADISON AVENUE CAMPAIGN ~~WITH THE SLOGAN:~~ WITH THE SLOGAN:  
"RIGHT FROM THE START". WHEN THIS CAMPAIGN IS  
OVER, THE PEOPLE WILL CONCLUDE THAT TOO OFTEN  
SENATOR MCGOVERN HAS BEEN WRONG FROM THE START.

*wrong from the start*

000184

ON VIETNAM, WE WERE BOTH WRONG FROM  
THE START.

SENATOR MCGOVERN HAS BEEN WRONG FROM THE  
START IN OPPOSING THE IMPROVEMENT <sup>OF UNEMPLOYMENT</sup> ~~PROGRAMS~~  
COMPENSATION, IN SUPPORTING THE RIGHT-TO-WORK,  
ANTI LABOR LAWS, IN ~~SIDING AGAINST~~ <sup>restating facts his position on</sup> ISRAEL.

AND TODAY HE IS WRONG FROM THE START

-4-

ON AT LEAST 3 MAJOR ISSUES:

1 HIS ENORMOUS, COSTLY, AND RADICAL  
WELFARE PROGRAMS, PLACING WELFARE ABOVE JOBS.

2. HIS MASSIVE AND DANGEROUS UNILATERAL  
CUTS IN OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE.

<sup>FINALLY,</sup>  
3. HIS CONFUSING AND CONTRADICTIONARY  
TAX PROPOSALS.

## CLOSING STATEMENT

I WANT TO BE YOUR PRESIDENT BECAUSE  
I BELIEVE IN THIS COUNTRY. I BELIEVE IN  
ITS PEOPLE. I KNOW THE PEOPLE -- THEIR  
HOPES -- THEIR FEARS AND THEIR DREAMS,  
AND I KNOW HOW TO TRANSLATE THOSE DREAMS,  
INTO REALITY.

-2-

PEOPLE MUST DECIDE WHICH CANDIDATE IS  
THE MOST QUALIFIED TO HOLD THE HIGH OFFICE  
OF PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

PEOPLE MUST DECIDE WHO HAS THE KNOW-HOW  
AND EXPERIENCE TO LEAD THE FIGHT FOR THE  
THINGS THAT HAVE TO BE DONE IN THIS COUNTRY.

WHEN NO ONE ELSE CARED, I LED THE FIGHT  
FOR MEDICARE, FOR COLLEGE SCHOLARSHIP LOANS,  
FOR THE CHILDREN OF WORKING FAMILIES, FOR  
VISTA, FOR THE PEACE CORPS, AND FOR CIVIL  
RIGHTS. I AUTHORED THE FIRST ANTI-WATER  
POLLUTION BILL IN THIS CENTURY -- LONG BEFORE

ECOLOGY WAS A POPULAR ISSUE.

AND I SAY THAT THE MEASURE OF A MAN'S  
VISION AND LEADERSHIP IS NOT WHAT HE'S FOR  
WHEN SOMETHING HAS BECOME POPULAR, BUT  
RATHER WHAT A MAN IS ABLE TO ACHIEVE WHEN  
OTHERS THOUGHT IT COULDN'T BE DONE.

I OFFER THIS RECORD -- <sup>OF</sup> VISION, OF  
LEADERSHIP, AND ACCOMPLISHMENT TO THE AMERICAN  
PEOPLE. AND I CHALLENGE ANY OTHERS TO MATCH  
THIS RECORD.

YOU MUST MAKE YOUR DECISION ON THE BASIS  
OF THIS RECORD AND ~~THESE CHALLENGES.~~

SUGGESTED ANSWER TO  
NEWSPAPER COLUMN

000188

I AM PLEASED THAT MANY OF THE SUGGESTIONS

I MADE IN THAT COLUMN HAVE SINCE COME TRUE,

I RECOMMENDED IN 1970 ~~THAT THERE BE~~ *and not to ever involvement in Vietnam*

*this* ~~A~~ 16 BILLION DOLLAR CUT IN VIETNAM. THERE HAS  
SINCE BEEN A 13 BILLION DOLLAR CUT.

I FELT IN 1970 THAT WASTE COULD BE CUT,  
AND THAT VERY YEAR, THE CONGRESS CUT 6 BILLION DOLLARS  
FROM THE DOD BUDGET.

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SENATOR MCGOVERNS  
POSITION AND MINE TODAY IS THAT HIS CUTS WOULD GO  
FAR BEYOND ANYTHING I CONTEMPLATED -- AND BECAUSE  
THEY ARE UNILATERAL -- WITH NO SOVIET AGREEMENT  
TO CUT THEIR FORCES BACK -- WOULD SERIOUSLY  
JEOPARDIZE OUR SECURITY.

000189

I OPPOSE SENATOR MCGOVERN'S PROPOSALS:

~~4.~~ TO REDUCE OUR STRATEGIC BOMBERS BY HALF.

TO CUT OUR FLEET IN HALF -- TO CUT

INTERCEPTOR SQUADRONS IN HALF --

TO CUT OUR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

FUNDS BY 30%.

SENATOR MCGOVERN'S CUTS ARE NOT

DESIGNED TO CUT WASTE. THEY ARE CUTS INTO THE VERY

MUSCLE AND BONE OF OUR FORCES.

*cannot 15-406*

HUMPHREY TAX PLAN

000190

CLOSE THE LOOP HOLES -- 16 BILLION DOLLARS

- 1. OIL AND GAS DEPLETION -- REDUCE TO 15% ~~BILLION DOLLARS~~
- 2. REVISE CAPITAL GAINS TAX -- DISCOURAGE SPECULATION  
AND ENCOURAGE INVESTMENT.
- 3. TAX FOREIGN SUBSIDIARIES U. S. CORPORATIONS
- 4. CUT OUT THE ASSET DEPRECIATION RANGE.
- 5. STRENGTHEN THE MINIMUM TAX.
- 6. THE HUMPHREY POOR PEOPLES TAX RELIEF AMENDMENT.

HUMPHREY TAX PLAN - PAGE 2

- 7. TAX CREDITS FOR PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS
- 8. OTHERS --- *Home remodeling*  
*Educator Deductions*

HUMPHREY JOB PROGRAM

000191

1. JOB OPPORTUNITIES ACT -1972  
ONE MILLION JOBS/250,000 YOUTH JOBS
2. COMMUNITY CONVERSION CORPORATIONS
3. INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT
4. ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS
5. NATIONAL DOMESTIC DEVELOPMENT BANK
6. TECHNOLOGICAL AND DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH FUNDS

McGOVERN ON TAXES

IN THE MAY 4 ISSUE OF NEW YORK REVIEW OF BOOKS  
McGOVERN OUTLINES SEVERAL NEW TAX PLANS, THE EFFECT  
OF WHICH WOULD PUNISH THE MIDDLE-CLASS; HE WOULD  
ELIMINATE ALL DEDUCTIONS INCLUDING MEDICAL COSTS,  
\$750 PER PERSON, INTEREST ON LOANS, INTEREST ON HOME  
MORTGAGE PAYMENTS, PROPERTY TAXES, STATE TAXES, AND SALES

TAXES. HE WOULD ALSO ADD A 20% SURCHARGE ON ALL TAXPAYERS.

UNDER THE MCGOVERN TAX PLAN, ELIMINATING AS A TAX DEDUCTION INTEREST ON HOME MORTGAGE PAYMENTS WOULD ALSO ELIMINATE CONSTRUCTION LOAN INTEREST FOR THE BUILDER. IT IS INEVITABLE THAT THE CONSTRUCTION AND PURCHASE OF HOMES WILL COME TO A NEAR STANDSTILL WITH

A SUBSEQUENT DROP IN EMPLOYMENT AND THE ECONOMY. IN ADDITION, BY VIRTUALLY ELIMINATING THE CAPITAL GAINS TAX, SENATOR MCGOVERN'S PROPOSAL WOULD TAX AS FULL INCOME ANY GAIN THAT THE HOME OWNER RECEIVES FROM SELLING THE LIFE-LONG INVESTMENT IN HIS HOME.

# Top Bill -

000193

## Taxes -

Loophole - Pass on stock & other capital assets with no capital gains Tax - close this

- ✓ Oil & Gas - Depletion <sup>reduce</sup> 22-15
- ✓ Foreign subsidiaries - take tax just like U.S. Corp
- ✓ Reverse cap. gains <sup>Tax</sup> \$0 as to discourage speculation & encourage investment.

High rate 1st yr - reduced each month

- Minimum Payment by all tax payers - above poverty level.

(1) ~~Consumer Tax~~ - Humphrey Poor Peoples Tax relief amend.

(2) Deduction for costs of handicapped Educa.

Tax credit for Homeowner remodeling - (middle & lower income) colleges & Parochial

yes I did say that -

until Calif. all to little attention  
 given to substance -  
 how chances narrowed

Have respect for a fellow Switzer  
 this does not prohibit  
 full discussion of issues

and in Particular issues that are  
 important to the country

- Defense urban
- welfare
- Taxes

(will you quit)

Don Chance, in 4 months  
 of Rank + file Democrats -  
 Don not going to give up this  
 fight on their behalf.

#

Israel - 1957

opposed Eisenhower Resol. to  
conduct the Program

Senate 1970 -

Burden of Concessions on Israel

- Returning occupied lands
- Jerusalem Internationalized
- Phantom jets.

\$500 million credits 1970  
\$300 " " "  
a 50 Aid

Israel pay reparations to Palestinians  
for land + emotional pain.

Oct 29, 1971 - Parvada Janet For Aid  
bill -

\$85 million support  
assistance to Israel



# 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)