

99—RAC—L

I think 10 countries in Latin America are exceeding the goals in terms of economic expansion and growth that were laid down in the conference at Punta del Este; 10 of them. Literally hundreds of thousands of new homes have been built. Over 1,000 cities and villages today have fresh water and sewage systems that didn't have it. An election was held in Venezuela. The Communists and the terrorists tried to destroy the constitutional Government of Venezuela. They didn't succeed. Democracy prevailed.

In Chile, a great threat from the left, but as you know, a man dedicated to Christian democracy was elected as the President of Chile. The Alliance for Progress succeeds. I think if we keep at it, and we can have the whole world clearly understand that this is our commitment—as President Kennedy said, this is the most critical area in the world as far as we are concerned. If we do that we will make it a success in cooperation with our neighbors to the south.

Mr. ROLFSON. Senator Humphrey, thank you very much indeed for being with us on "Issues and Answers."

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you.

The ANNOUNCER. Our guest was Democratic vice-presidential candidate, Senator Hubert Humphrey, of Minnesota, brought to you live from Albuquerque, N. Mex. We hope that you will join us next week at this time for more "Issues and Answers."

Albuquerque, N. Mex.
Western Skies Motel
September 13, 1964

PRESS CONFERENCE OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

QUESTION. Senator Goldwater has spoken out quite a lot against lawlessness and he has cited, among other things, riots and demonstrations which generally are known as racial in origin. What do you believe he is getting at? Do you regard it as a subtle way of injecting the racial issue in this campaign, of appealing to what is called the white backlash vote?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, Mr. Mazo, I doubt that I could draw any other conclusion than the fact that the Senator from Arizona is equating the violence that takes place in certain cities with the race issue and the civil rights bill. I regret to see this sort of display of playing upon the emotions of the American people at the expense of better understanding and better relationships between the races.

Now, let me make it crystal clear, as the vice-presidential nominee of my party, and as a U.S. Senator, as the running mate of President Johnson, that this administration will extend every conceivable help from the Federal Government that is within the purview of our constitutional powers to assist State and local authorities in maintaining law and order.

I have said before and I repeat it again that civil wrongs do not make for civil rights, that the first requirement of good government is to maintain peace and tranquillity at a community and national level. The President has, as you know, ordered the Federal Bureau of Investigation to examine into these riots and disorders, these incidents of looting and pillaging to see whether or not there is a pattern. Because there are those who believe, on the basis of some evidence, that these disorders are the product of professional agitators—Communists, Ku Kluxers, hoodlums, dope addicts, and other nefarious elements.

I wish that the Republican spokesman would also give some attention to the great social injustice which exists in some of our metropolitan areas and some of the problems that local officials face in these areas and that the people face. Let us take one example—Harlem. There was disorder in Harlem some time ago—rioting, looting. But it is reported that not more than a thousand people were involved out of a total population in Harlem of over 250,000 living within an area of 3.5 square miles. If the same density of population were found in all parts of New York as in Harlem, the entire population of the United States could be placed in three boroughs of New York City.

Now, this unbelievable density of population, the inadequacy of educational opportunity, the influx of people from the share-crop economy, poorly equipped emotionally and mentally, or I should say

100—RAC—L

HHF 1

educationally, for industrialized living—all of this has added to the problem. So this is why we insist upon programs of education and manpower retraining, the war on poverty, the youth camps for the school dropouts.

And amongst our Negro youth, regrettably, there is a high rate of unemployment. Unemployed youth power can cause great trouble. What we ought to be doing is finding ways and means of providing opportunity for these young people.

The law shall be enforced, the Federal Government will aid wherever it can, and it is. And I would suggest that national spokesmen for any political party quit playing loose and free with racial problems and the Civil Rights Act. It would be much better to encourage observance of the law, respect for the law, and understanding of the law.

QUESTION. Senator, it appears the President is pitting you against Senator Goldwater while he works in other areas. Is this the case and does this please you?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, the President isn't pitting me against anybody. I am traveling around the United States as a candidate of the Democratic Party for the office of Vice President to bring the message of the Kennedy-Johnson administration, the record of our achievements and our accomplishments, the statement of our platform for the future, and also to contrast the record of Mr. Goldwater with that of President Johnson, contrast the record of the Republican platform with that of the Democratic platform. I will carry on a good deal of the campaign responsibility while our President undertakes the heavy duties of his offices, the Chief Executive of this land.

QUESTION. Senator Goldwater charged that President Kennedy played politics with the Cuban missile crisis and President Johnson is now doing the same with Vietnam. What about that?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, Mr. Scherer, I deeply regret that Mr. Goldwater has seen fit to make that statement, and I do hope and I believe that after sober reflection of what he said, he will retract it. He should. I say that because as a U.S. Senator and a member of the Armed Services Committee and a Reserve general in the Air Force, and one who is entitled to all information of a security nature from this Government, the Senator knows better. He knows that what he said is not true, or at least he can find out that it is not true.

What happened in the Cuban crisis is a matter now of historical record. The missiles were discovered by our aerial reconnaissance after careful examination of photographic evidence by the Intelligence Services of this Government, and by the Central Intelligence Agency, headed by John McCone, a Republican and a prominent one. The President of the United States took what action was necessary to safeguard the security of this country. I do not know of anyone who really believes that President Kennedy played politics with the Cuban crisis, and I hope and pray that no one will ever again make that statement, because the peace of the world was at stake.

Now, in terms of Vietnam, it is indeed shoddy and shabby political talk for any person who ought to know better and who has the means of finding out the truth to accuse any President of the United States of trying to contrive an international incident for personal or narrow political partisan purposes.

This is untrue. It is most regrettable that it was ever said, and in order to cleanse the record I think the Republican spokesman ought to retract it and ought to explain to the American people that he has been given the opportunity by the President to have all the information relating to our foreign policy and our national security at his disposal at any time.

QUESTION. Senator, you have had occasion in the Senate to observe Senator Mechem, who was opposed by Representative Montoya. Could you tell us how you feel about these two gentlemen?

HHF 2

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I try not to come into a State of another Senator and in any way do him a disservice. I try to be respectful, friendly. You know, it has been said that we Senators have the most exclusive club in the world. I am not sure that that is a factual statement, but it makes good legend. I am here to encourage the election of Joe Montoya. I am here to do that because the Republican Senator from this State seems to cancel out the good that a great Senator from New Mexico, Clinton Anderson, seeks to do for your State.

I have a feeling that New Mexico is going to do in 1964 what it did in 1960, only more so, give a great vote of support for President Johnson. It voted for President Kennedy in 1960. And if you are going to vote for President Johnson, you ought to send to the U.S. Senate a Senator that will in the main attempt to support President Johnson's program.

I checked the record of Senator Mechem and he has voted about two thirds of the time opposite to Senator Anderson. He apparently has had a few observations to make about me. He is entitled to do that. But I would only say that I have been elected by the people of my State, three times, and I generally am in the Senate attending to my duties as U.S. Senator. And I know that Joe Montoya will do exactly that as U.S. Senator.

The best place to be a Senator, Joe, is to be in the Senate—and be elected.

QUESTION. Senator, can we assume that there is a get-tough policy on the part of the United States in Vietnam rather than a policy of trying to pacify the situation and avoid a conflict at all costs?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I don't think the situation is quite that simple, sir, I say most respectfully. We are in Vietnam at the request of the Vietnamese Government. We are seeking to work with what government is there to bring stability, to maintain military strength against the Vietcong, the Communist guerrilla warriors and infiltrators and aggressors. We are seeking to promote a healthier economy and that, by the way, is developing and happening.

Our policy is not one that you can put a label on of get tough or get soft. It is one of doing what needs to be done to assure the territorial integrity and the independence of the free nation of Vietnam. And we have no intention of letting that part of the world be overrun by Communist aggression, and we will take whatever steps are necessary in terms of our commitments to that area to assure that freedom prevails and that Communist aggression is defeated.

QUESTION. Senator, in your travels around the country, you have been appealing for the votes of the so-called good Republicans. If the polls are any guide, you seem to be making considerable headway. What effect do you think this phenomenon, if translated in a Democratic landslide in November, will have on the country's traditional two-party system?

Senator HUMPHREY. It is my view from many conferences and visits that I have had with people that are rather prominent in Republican circles that a large number of good, solid, constructive Republicans are going to vote for President Johnson for President in November. I believe that the views of public opinion measurement, like our polls, demonstrate this. There seems to be at least a rather substantial number of Republicans that you call moderates—the Eisenhower Republicans, the Scranton Republicans, the Rockefeller-type Republicans, the middle-of-the-road Republicans—that cannot bring themselves to follow the lead of Mr. Goldwater. They have put their country above their party and they have put their principles above political accommodation.

The trouble seems to be that the Goldwater faction demands complete subservience to their rule and many good people resent that, and justly so.

Now, you asked the question what would be the result if there is an overwhelming Democratic victory, which I hope there is. I think the result will be that the Republican Party will be rejuvenated; that the moderates and those of traditional Republican persuasion, the kind of Republicans that we have known about for years, will move in once again to reclaim the leadership of their party.

Actually, what they feel has happened is that the party has been kidnaped, the leadership has been. And I have a feeling that the

3 HHF

regular moderate Republican will make a hard fight to once again reclaim the leadership of the party, as, for example, recently happened in the State of California. So it will not be the end of the two-party system, Mr. Glass. It may very well result in a much more revitalized Republican Party which will cause the Democrats trouble ahead.

QUESTION. A related question. Do you and Mr. Johnson, both of whom have made some rather definite overtures to the like-minded Republicans, do you feel that their support is necessary? Do you feel there is going to be enough Democratic defection that you are going to have to rely on this element of the Republican Party, and then a very closely related question, if you feel the Republicans are successful—I mean if the Republicans do give you a great deal of support—that might prove to be a handicap to you in your actual administration?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, first, I suppose it would be possible to win an election without great defection in the Republican ranks, but one who is running for office always appreciates the support he can get from good, wholesome elements of American society, and we always have a number of people in both parties who cross over somewhat in their votes. But I want to say once again that I think it is important that in this election, people who have basic agreement upon goals and objectives unite, and that for all practical purposes, we have a force of national unity that will demonstrate to certain elements in American life, such as the extreme elements represented by the Birch Society, the Ku Kluxer, the Commies and others of their ilk, that these people are a noisy but ineffective minority and that they have no opportunity or chance to have anything to say about the guidelines of American life in the years ahead. So I think this victory is very important.

Now, the second part. I don't think we will have any trouble as a result of this kind of support; in fact, it will be very good.

The truth is that as a U.S. Senator, I found out that on most great issues, on the big issues, you generally have support in both parties. As I have said a number of times on the nuclear test ban issue, for example, the majority of Republicans and the majority of Democrats voted for that treaty. On the tax bill, a majority of the Republicans and a majority of the Democrats voted for that bill. On many issues, that is the case.

On most of those issues, may I say that the majority of the Republicans and Democrats voted together, but not Senator Goldwater.

QUESTION. Thank you, Senator.

Article

News Release From the Democratic National Committee
September 13, 1964

"GOVERNMENT AND THE GREAT SOCIETY," TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY, DEMOCRATIC VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE, SEPTEMBER 13, 1964, SANTA FE, N. MEX.

In 1960 John Fitzgerald Kennedy challenged America to get moving again. And we moved.

Like Moses, President Kennedy was only given to see—not cross over—into the Promised Land. But his chosen Joshua—Lyndon Baines Johnson—asked us to "continue." And we did continue.

Now on the threshold of that promise, Lyndon Johnson has challenged Americans to build the Great Society. This call to greatness is a traditional part of American life, but as President Johnson has said: "It is a challenge constantly renewed, beckoning us toward a destiny where the meaning of our lives matches the marvelous products of our labor."

Like every society, the Great Society will have a government. It will be a government big enough to fulfill its responsibilities, strong enough to protect our liberties, with heart enough to feel the needs of its people, and with understanding enough to heed their will.

4 HHF

There are those among us who seek to divide America—so that they may conquer. There are those among us who seek to engender hostility between the Federal Government and the State capitals, between the people and the government at all levels.

I say these persons do America—and themselves—a great disservice. I say these persons profoundly misunderstand the necessary and legitimate role which government assumes in the lives of every citizen. And these persons sow the seeds of discord and distrust between a government and her people which can destroy a great nation and humble a great people.

American government is more than Washington. American government is Washington, the State capitol, the county courthouse, the city and village halls, the town meetings, and the thousands of other independent governmental authorities. And all these governments are united in one effort: To serve the American people—you, me, your friends, and neighbors. That is what American government is all about.

The temporary spokesman of the Republican Party cannot understand that people and government are not separated on any level. *The people are the government.* It is their tool to use—not an enemy to abuse. And that is what democracy is all about.

Federal Government supports and supplements local government. It does not supplant it. Most Americans have welcomed the concern of the National Government for better education.

But not Senator Goldwater.

Most Americans have been glad that the Government cared about housing and helped middle- and low-income families obtain it.

But not Senator Goldwater.

Most Americans have been glad that civil rights and equal opportunity have been the concern of their Government.

But not Senator Goldwater.

Most Americans have appreciated assistance in sewer plant construction and urban renewal.

But not Senator Goldwater.

Senator Goldwater believes in reducing Government by pinching people. He has been against the antipoverty program, youth conservation, area redevelopment, vocational education, and manpower retraining. Where people are concerned, he is against, against, against.

Senator Goldwater seeks not a Government to serve the people of America. He seeks merely to reduce the size of Government, regardless of the impact of such action on national defense, education, social welfare, veterans benefits, and thousands of essential governmental services.

Government by destruction and reduction never met the problems of any people * * * in any country * * * at any time. And Government by destruction and reduction will not meet the challenges of America in the 20th century.

We seek government not for its own sake, but for the peoples' sake. And we believe the New Deal of Franklin Roosevelt, the Fair Deal of Harry S. Truman, the New Frontier of John F. Kennedy, and the Great Society of Lyndon B. Johnson have served the people of America—and the people of America know it.

We hear the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party talking about a Federal Government obsessed in enlarging its own role and its own employees at the expense of the people. But what has actually taken place since World War II? What has actually happened in America at the Federal level and at the State and local levels? And what has happened right here in New Mexico?

Since 1946 Federal spending has increased 53 percent. In New Mexico State spending is up 732 percent.

Since 1946 the Federal debt has risen 13 percent. The debt of New Mexico has grown 221 percent.

Since World War II, the Federal payroll is up 166 percent. The New Mexico State payroll is up 526 percent.

Since 1946, Federal taxes went up 118 percent before the recent tax cut which lowered them. In New Mexico taxes are up 406 percent.

Since the war the number of Federal employees is *down* 9 percent. In New Mexico, they have increased 277 percent.

5 HHF

This is not a criticism; it is factual analysis that tells the story of a growing and demanding America. The willingness of New Mexico's fine State, county and local governments to assume a greater share of our common burden deserves explicit recognition and commendation. So, let's stop suggesting that the localities have either sold out or caved in to the Federal Government. This is one Senator who considers them very much alive.

Of course, government has grown. What did anyone expect in these last 19 years during which 69 million people were born in these United States, when we have added more people than the entire population of Great Britain, and are still increasing at the rate of 3 million a year?

Government has grown with the people and their problems—with the needs for schools and homes, for highways and sewers for police and fire protection—and above all at the national level, for defense. Government has accommodated the changing needs of the people. It has expanded to protect the public interest.

Here in New Mexico you know that only a Federal Government could have established the Manhattan Project, or could sponsor the research at Los Alamos. Here in New Mexico you have one of the largest concentrations of scientific and engineering talent in the world. You know that in this scientific, technological and space age, the nation that is second in these areas is the nation that is last.

The great San Juan-Chama reclamation project is also part of the free world's total strength, even as it enriches this great State. But one State cannot build such a project alone—not even the great State of New Mexico.

And does Senator Goldwater think Arizona can build its great water conservation and development project in central Arizona alone? No, indeed, he wants \$1.2 billion of Federal money. But this is an investment in America, in its people, in its future, and in its progress.

Let me say a special word about President Johnson's war on poverty. It is no coincidence that the Hebrew word for charity is righteousness. St. Paul talks of charity which "never faileth." Jew and Christian here do not mean charity as a handout or a permanent soup kitchen or even as a Christmas basket. They mean by charity man's right to self-esteem and self-respect. They mean by charity a willingness to fight deprivation and ignorance, a willingness to share not only love but all things.

No, it is not a matter of a handout. It is a matter of a collective effort of the richest society in the world to remove not only the stigma of the handout, but also to eliminate poverty itself by adding to our total wealth and building ourselves a tremendous democracy of human dignity for the future.

And the Democratic Party does not intend to let the poor of America become the hostages of a Goldwater victory this fall.

The temporary Republican spokesman claims to offer this country a choice—and so he does.

A choice between vigor and vacuum;

A choice between action and apathy;

A choice between hope and despair;

A choice between giving your brother bread or a stone when he seeks your help.

America can sustain its faith in the promise of the future if we are led by men of hope, not fear; men of vision, not diversion. And Lyndon B. Johnson is such a man.

He profoundly believes in the capacity for goodness in all men. He has faith in their wisdom to create, to control, and to conserve a government strong enough to protect their liberties—and with heart enough to understand their needs.

And—my friends—America has faith in Lyndon B. Johnson.

6 HHF

Santa Fe, N. Mex.
Santa Fe Fair Grounds,
September 13, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Viva Joe Montoya.

Como esta, mis amigos. Saludos and viva L.B.J. My dear friends, my very dear friends. First of all, let me say to Joe that I want you to introduce me in Spanish on this occasion. I don't know a word that you said, but it sure sounded good.

Occasionally I would get that word "grande," and, Oh, I liked that one.

Gov. Jack Campbell, Congressman Morris, Congressman Johnnie Walker, Governor Burroughs and Governor Miles, your distinguished Lieutenant Governor, Mack Easley, and, of course, our chairman of the day, your outstanding State's Senator, Chavez, and my good friend the chairman of the Tribal Council of the Navahos, Raymond Nakai.

I want to say it is wonderful to see you again, Raymond. We had a very pleasant day together in Washington, and I must say that of all the fine citizens that have been to our Nation's Capital, I have never met one that was more well received, more honorable, more distinguished in his presence and in his performance than the chairman, Raymond Nakai. Raymond, my blessings upon you.

Governor Campbell, I see that you got the right idea. I look out here and I see the signs that say New Mexico, Go, Go, Go. And then I think of that gentleman from Arizona that keeps saying no, no, no. All I can say is that if the people of the Southwest will follow the example of Jack Campbell and just go, go, go, I can assure you that the gentleman from Arizona won't go any place but home.

My fellow Democrats, my fellow citizens, and our many Republican friends that have gathered here again with us today, this is truly an all-American meeting.

People of many cultures, people of many ethnic groups and many origins, people of many races, but all Americans, every one of us, and proud of it. And I believe today that as I speak to you, I speak not merely as a Democrat or for the Democratic Party, but when I see the great national support that our President has these days, I believe that it can be said now that the Democratic Party under Lyndon B. Johnson is the all-American party for all Americans.

What a beautiful day you have. What beautiful, beautiful mountains, these valleys, this wonderful sky, the freshness of this air—it is tailor made for Democrats, tailor made for us. It makes one want to say, "Viva" every other word.

And when you look out over this audience, this huge audience, and see these signs, see these expressions of welcome, welcome that has come from the heart, these expressions of support that come from your hands and your heart, and your mind, I would be less than honest with you if I didn't tell you that I love it. I love it and I know that it spells good things ahead. It tells me that on November 3, something is going to happen in this country that you want to happen. On November 3, you are going to see to it that Lyndon B. Johnson and Hubert H. Humphrey and the Democrats are elected.

Let me just reminisce with you for a few moments. I am sure you remember when our late beloved President was in your State. I am sure you remember those sterling words of this bright and brave and valiant, exciting young man that was our President, John Kennedy.

And I am sure that every one of you here feels as I do, that the work that he started it is our duty to continue and to carry on. I am sure you remember in 1960, when John Kennedy was a candidate for President, he spoke to us and he challenged America. He challenged America to get moving, to go. He challenged America to move ahead all over America, and particularly in the great Southwest, in New Mexico.

But like Moses of Biblical times, President Kennedy was only given to see, not to cross over into the Promised Land. But his chosen Joshua, Lyndon Baines Johnson, has asked us to continue and I think

7 HHH

that it is only right that here today, we resolve individually and together that we will continue the work that was so nobly begun.

Now, on the threshold of that promise, President Lyndon Johnson has challenged Americans to build a better America, to build what he calls the Great Society. And this call to greatness is a traditional part of American life. But as President Johnson has said in such eloquent words, it is a challenge that is constantly renewed, beckoning us to a destiny where the meaning of our lives matches the marvelous products of our labor.

Like every society, my fellow Americans, the Great Society that we look toward will have, of course, a government. And it will be, despite the man from Arizona, a government big enough to fulfill its responsibilities, a government strong enough to protect our liberties, a government, Senator Montoya, with heart enough to fill the needs of its people, and with understanding enough to heed the will of the people. That is the kind of government we want.

Now, there are those who would seek to divide us, to divide America so that they may win elections, so that they may conquer. And there are those amongst us who seek to breed hostility between the Federal Government and your State government, between State capitals and city halls, between farmers and workers, between people at all levels of society and government. These are the agents of division; these are the men of retreat.

Now, these persons that I speak of, and they are at loose in the land, some of them seeking high public office, these persons do America and themselves a great disservice. I say these persons profoundly misunderstand the legitimate role which government assumes in the lives of every citizen, and these persons sow the seed of discord and distrust between a government and the people which, if it continues and if it isn't checked on election day, can destroy a great Nation and humble a great people.

You know, American government is not all in Washington. It is much more than Washington. American government is Washington, the State capital, the county courthouse, the city, and the village halls, and up my way, the township board, and the thousands of other independent governmental units. And all of these governments that are government of the people, by the people, and for the people are united in one effort, to serve the American people, to serve you and to serve me, your friends and your neighbors. And that is what American government is all about. And it seems it is about time that a candidate for the office of Presidency would understand this simple lesson in American civics.

The Federal Government supports and supplements local government. It doesn't take over the job of your Governor or of your county commissioners or of your legislature. Most Americans have welcomed the concern of the National Government. Most Americans look upon compassion and charity as strength of character, not weakness of spirit. Most Americans look upon your National and State Government when it expresses concern over the unfortunate as an act of decency and humanitarianism, not an act of socialism.

But not Senator Goldwater.

Now, most Americans, most Americans and particularly those of us in New Mexico and Minnesota, we believe in help for the depressed areas where there are jobless and where there are needy, and most Members of Congress believe that way, too, and voted for the Area Redevelopment Act to help Americans help themselves.

But not Senator Goldwater.

And most Americans thought it was right for the Federal and the State and the local governments to unite together to build roads and sewage disposal systems, to help cities and towns and villages with necessary public works. And your Congress passed an accelerated public works program with an overwhelming vote.

Yet, Congress passed it and voted for it.

But not Senator Goldwater.

And most Americans, my dear friends, welcome the concern of your National Government for better education for our children.

But not Senator Goldwater.

8 HHF

And most Americans have been glad that the Government cared about the housing of our people, of our middle-income people, of our low-income people, of our rural people. And the Congress voted for it. But not Senator Goldwater.

And, my good friends, most Americans rejoiced in the fact that the Congress passed civil rights legislation to provide equal opportunity for all Americans. Yes, Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike, overwhelmingly supported it. But not Senator Goldwater.

And most Americans, my good friends, have appreciated the assistance that has been extended from their Government to their communities for a host of projects that have enriched our lives and bettered our communities. And Members of Congress in both parties, on occasion after occasion, have voted for these programs.

But not Senator Goldwater.

That is the record, my friends. A record of a thousand noes, and no go, go, goes.

Now, the Senator from Arizona likes to talk about reducing government. He believes in reducing government by pinching people. He has been against the Economic Opportunity Act, the war-on-poverty program. He is against the youth conservation program to put our young men at work in gainful occupations, helping to build a better America and better lives for themselves, against area redevelopment, against expanded vocational education, against manpower retraining. Where the Government and the people are concerned, the temporary spokesman of the Goldwater faction of the Republican Party is against, against, against—no, no, no. And I say no to him, too.

This spokesman of retreat seeks not a government to serve the people of America. He seeks primarily to criticize, and regardless of the impact of that criticism on national defense, upon education, social welfare, veterans benefits, aid to our Indian tribes, and thousands of other essential government services—despite the impact of the criticism, the criticism has poured down upon us like a desert sandstorm. Government by criticism and complaint never met the problems of any people in any country at any time. And government by destruction and reduction will not meet the challenge of America in the 20th century.

We seek government not for its own sake. Government is not our master; it is our servant. We seek government for the people's sake and we believe that the New Deal of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and the Fair Deal of Harry S. Truman, and the New Frontier of John F. Kennedy, and the Great Society of Lyndon Johnson have served the people of America and the people of America know it.

Of course, Government has grown. This is a growing country. Sometimes, some people seeking high office forget that. This is not the American of, you know, the cowboy days. This isn't the America of the 19th century. It is the America of the fast-moving, of the fast-growing, dynamic second half of the 20th century. (comma) X

Government has grown because we have grown; our population has grown, our needs have grown. What did anyone expect in these last 19 years during which 69 million new people have become citizens of the United States, when we have added more people to our population than the entire population of Great Britain? That is what has happened in your America in less than 20 years. Maybe we should send those facts to the Republican National Committee and let them study them for awhile.

Government has grown, that is right. The needs of our people have grown for schools and for homes. Your Governor in this State can tell you that the rise in the cost of State and local government has not been because somebody just wanted it that way, but because this State is a growing commonwealth, because this is a great State and has the need for more public services for a greater population and a greater economic activity, need for schools and homes, for highways and sewers, for police and fire protection, and, above all, in these recent years, a need for national defense.

I have often wondered how the temporary spokesman for the Republican Party can ask for more money for national defense, cut taxes 25 percent, and balance the budget all at one time. If he can pull that

9 HHH

one off, he makes Houdini look like a piker. He knows he can't. And one of the reasons he feels free to talk about it, he knows he will never have the chance, because he is not going to be President.

Well, dear friends, here in New Mexico, you know a little bit about government. You know that only a Federal Government with powerful resources could have established the Manhattan project or could sponsor research at Los Alamos. And you have here in New Mexico one of the largest concentrations of civic and engineering talent in the world. And I want you to know that as the spokesman for this administration, not only do you have that large concentration of engineering and scientific talent, that you are going to be able to keep it and it is going to be able to grow with the help of your government.

We are fully aware of the remarkable achievements of Los Alamos. The atomic age was born here. We are fully aware of the great new research facilities going up at your university.

And might I add that new medical school that is being built, that new medical school is being constructed with the help of the Federal funds under the Aid to Medical Facilities Act, under the Aid to Higher Education, which, by the way, your junior Senator voted against, and which, by the way, Barry Goldwater voted against.

Your great laboratories of Sandia and Albuquerque, the White Sands Missile Range for space research—these are the results of cooperation between New Mexico and your Federal Government, between the people and their government, and I give you this pledge, that these great installations which mean so much to the safety and the peace of the world, which mean so much to the power of America, which mean so much to the welfare of humanity, that these great facilities will be maintained, they will be improved, they will be expanded, and they will be with you in New Mexico if you help us.

The great San Juan-Chama reclamation project is also a part of the free world's total strength, even as it enriches this great State. But one State can't build such a project alone, not even the great State of New Mexico. The Navajo Indian irrigation project which means so much to your great people—Raymond, that project could not be built by a tribe or a State alone; it required the help of a considerate and compassionate and a friendly Federal Government.

And does the Senator from Arizona think that Arizona can build its own water conservation and development project in central Arizona alone? Oh, no, not when it comes to Arizona.

No, indeed, he wants \$1,200 million of Federal money for the central Arizona project. And he is going to get it, because it is good for America.

This is an investment in people, an investment in resources, an investment in our strength.

Now, New Mexico is a very lucky State. You have a good Governor, you are going to keep him. I know you are. You are good Congressmen, and you are going to send one to U.S. Senate and you are going to elect someone to take his place.

And they tell me, Congressman Morris, you don't have real competition, so I am just going to salute you now on your reelection.

But let me also add right now that you had a wonderful and beloved man who was taken from us, but his memory lives on and his good works live on.

I knew the late and beloved Dennis Chavez and knew him well. And let me say this for this departed soul, that his heart was big in that little body. His heart was strong and it was compassionate and it was good. He gave of himself to the unfortunate, the lowly, to the needy, and he fought every moment of his life for the welfare of the people that he represented and for the security of this Nation.

And I say to you that a man like that should have a good successor, one that walks in the same shoes, in the same spirit, and that is why Joe Montoya must go to the Senate.

I know that you practically have fulfilled your goal for the money that you are raising for the statue in Statuary Hall in Washington for this great U.S. Senator, the late Senator Chavez. I want to be there as your Vice President when that statue is dedicated in Statuary Hall.

10 HHH

But New Mexico is privileged to have one of the most effective and outstanding Senators in all the Congress at work in this very hour there. That is your senior Senator from this State, Clinton Anderson. This Senator has been elected to the Senate, not appointed. And this Senator has been elected again and again, serving not only as Senator but as Congressman and Cabinet officer. He is recognized for his great contributions in the field of conservation and agriculture, irrigation and reclamation, medicare and health, space and science, and national security. This man deserves to have a working partner in the Senate. At the present time, his vote is canceled out by the vote of a Republican Senator, so that New Mexico's contribution, a contribution that could be great, is neutralized because you sent a no, no, no man down there. Or should I say because he sent a no, no, no man down there.

A man with the leadership capacity of Senator Clinton Anderson needs a partner and he needs a working partner, a fighting partner like Joe Montoya, and Joe, I know as you know that Senator Anderson wants you. He supports you, he welcomes you, and he asked me to urge this audience to redouble your efforts to make sure that Joe Montoya goes to the U.S. Senate to help Lyndon Johnson.

Yes, sir, Joe, Viva Montoya.

By the way, I like him, too, and I would like to see him down there. You know, I am going to preside over that Senate if you will let me, and I would like to look down there and see Joe Montoya.

You know, sometimes, friends, you forget what good work these men do. Congressman Montoya has been a tower of strength for us in our relationship with Latin America. He has gone all over that great part of the world, the Western Hemisphere, speaking the language of the people, understanding their needs and helping us develop the Alliance for Progress and helping us develop the good neighbor policy once again between the United States and our sister republics south of the Rio Grande. That is the kind of a man you need these days.

Now, my friends, let me say just a few words now about President Johnson's war on poverty, because this war on poverty affects this State. New Mexico, like many other States in this Union, has pockets of depression, people that need help, people that seek help, and people who are anxious to do something with their lives.

You know, it is no coincidence that the Biblical word for charity is righteousness. St. Paul, the Apostle St. Paul, talks of charity which never faileth. Charity, the Bible tells us, is man's right to self-esteem and self-respect. Charity is a willingness to fight deprivation and ignorance, a willingness to share not only love but to share all things. It is not a matter of a handout. No one is asking for that. It is a matter of collective effort, community effort, of the richest society in the world, to remove not only the stigma of the handout but also to eliminate poverty itself by adding to our total wealth and building ourselves a tremendous progressive democracy of human dignity for the future.

Never forget this, my fellow Americans; the difference between a free people and a free society and between the Communist society of collectivism and slavery is basically human dignity and the respect that we have in democracy and democratic society for the dignity of man, for his work, for his spiritual work. And whenever man lives in fear and ignorance, whenever he lives in poverty of spirit and the poverty of mind as well as the poverty of the purse, that man has lost his dignity.

What we seek to do in these programs more than anything else is to help people to help themselves, to lift themselves out of the shadows of ignorance into the bright sunshine of enlightenment; to lift themselves up to accomplishment and from the beds of depression. They can do it if you give them a chance.

The Government of the United States owes no man success or a living. But this Government owes every man an equal opportunity to make something out of his life. And your President and your party are dedicated to the proposition of opening up these pathways of opportunity to every man, woman, and child, regardless of race or color or creed or national origin, and we will do it if you work together as a people.

11 HHF

Now, my friends, the Democratic Party does not intend to let the poor of America become the hostages of a Goldwater victory this fall. The temporary spokesman claims to offer this country a choice, and believe me, he does: A choice between vigor and vacuum; a choice between action and apathy; a choice between vitality and paralysis; a choice between hope and despair; a choice between giving your brother bread or giving him a stone when he seeks your help.

I say that that choice will be made and I think I know the kind of a choice that you are going to make. It is a choice for President Johnson in the White House.

Now, let me leave you with a neighborly note, because we are neighbors. No matter how far we are apart in terms of today, because of modern communication, we are neighbors. But New Mexico has two immediate neighbors, one to the west, the Republican spokesman, who, when faced with a decision as to whether or not we should wage war on poverty, voted no. Then there is the neighbor to the east, in Texas, who gave the declaration of war on poverty. He called upon all Americans to eradicate from our midst this blight of economic, social, and moral distress. Lyndon Baines Johnson, our Commander in Chief, wages war on poverty and the man from Arizona, he wages war on progress. That is the choice.

President Johnson needs your help. He has asked me to come here to ask for your help. We need your hand, we need your heart, we need your willing cooperation.

Never take this election for granted, despite how good it may look now. We are in for the fight of our lives, because those who seek to gain power in this country will do all they possibly can to achieve that goal. And if we do less, we not only fail ourselves but we fail our America. Our President has faith in the vision and the wisdom of the people, faith in the wisdom of the people to create and to control and to conceive a government strong enough to protect their liberties, and with heart enough to understand their needs.

And, my friends, unless I am mistaken, the American people, as of this hour, and in the weeks ahead, have faith in the President of the United States, that President for 4 more years by your will and your vote, to be President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Thank you.

Article

Democratic National Committee

September 14, 1964

TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY,
DEMOCRATIC VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE, SPRINGFIELD, MO.

Sixteen years ago, and close by this city, President Harry S. Truman went to bed on election night—by the verdict of every public opinion poll and certain well-known commentators—a rejected and defeated man. He awoke the victor in the most dramatic upset in American political history.

It is well to recall the experience of 1948, because it should be both a warning and an example to us.

It should be a solemn warning never to let ourselves fall victim to complacency—or to be so confident of victory that we do not, in Harry Truman's good words, "do our damndests" to win.

It is a depressing thought, but the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party *could* be—despite himself—the President of the United States.

But only if we let him win.

His finger—or the finger of some field commander, as he has advocated—could be on the nuclear trigger.

But only if we let him win.

Voluntary social security and a regressive income tax could become the law of the land.

But only if we let him win.

TVA could be sold to private enterprise and farm supports abolished.

(?) damndest

X

12 HHF

But only if we let him win.

Federal assistance in urban redevelopment and housing programs could be ended.

But only if we let him win.

In fact, the social and economic achievements of the past three decades could be in grave jeopardy.

But only if we let him win.

All this *could* happen if we let it. And, if we do, history will not forgive us—if, indeed, there are people left with the ability and the heart to write it.

They say a great thing about George Washington as a general, was that he never forgot—not for a single moment in 7 long and hard years—that he was the one man who, by a single ill-judged action, could lose the war for independence.

Today the President of the United States is the one and only man in the free world who, by a single error in judgment, a momentary lapse in responsibility, can risk its annihilation.

Yes, it *is* that important who sits in the White House. As Harry Truman used to say—and it is even more profoundly true today: “The buck stops here.”

As for myself, I promise you that I shall leave nothing undone, no mile untraveled, no word unspoken that will help keep responsibility and maturity—in the person of President Lyndon B. Johnson—in the White House.

Yes, 1948 is a solemn warning which all of us must keep in mind. But it is also an example and an inspiration.

President Truman won, as we Democrats have always won, by taking his case directly to the American people.

Up and down the land he denounced the “do-nothing” 80th Congress for defaulting in its duties to the people.

He certainly “gave ‘em hell”—but he never hit below the belt. It would have been totally out of character—and he didn’t need to, anyway.

He didn’t need to stoop to personal abuse. You don’t need to when your case is good. It is only when you have a weak case, or none at all, that the temptation may be—for some people—too strong to resist.

This administration and this Congress have a magnificent record to bring before the American people. It is a record of pledges made and pledges kept, of promise and performance.

I commend that record to you for careful study and constant use. It is set forth in black and white, for everyone to read, in our 1964 Democratic platform, “One Nation, One People.”

It is a detailed accounting of our stewardship.

It is a record of the accomplishments of President Kennedy in his 1,000 days of office, and of President Johnson in his remarkable 9 months. It is a record of the two Democratic Congresses of the past 4 years—the most fruitful in achievement since I first came to Washington in 1949.

Abroad, it is a record of peace through preparedness and power—and restraint in the use of our power.

At home, it is a record of economic thrust and vigor.

Gone but I hope not forgotten is the “stop-and-go” economy of the Eisenhower years—what I used to call the “cha-cha-cha” economy, forward and backward with a little shuffle in between.

Instead, we are now in our 43d straight month of sustained economic growth—the longest unbroken peacetime expansion in our history.

Our economic growth rate has risen to over 5 percent a year—twice what it averaged in the years of 1953 through 1960.

Most Americans know that they are better off than they were 4 years ago. Real wages are up. Unemployment is down. Profits are up. Farm incomes have risen.

Meanwhile, we have not forgotten those of our fellow citizens who need our help. We have acted to give increased care and attention to the young and to the old, to the physically and mentally afflicted. We have demonstrated once again that progressive government is government with a warm heart as well as a sound head.

13 HHF

These are significant facts—known to all Americans, and not seriously disputed by our opponents.

But it is infinitely more significant, I believe, that in this affluent society—the most affluent the world has ever known—we have committed ourselves to an all-out war against the poverty that still persists in the midst of our plenty.

I sometimes wonder what would have happened if, at the Cow Palace in San Francisco 2 months ago, a speaker had mounted the rostrum and put the question: "Am I my brother keeper?"

Would the majority at that convention have nodded their heads, or would they have chorused "No."

I don't venture to say. But I do say that there is little sign of an affirmative answer in the platform they adopted.

As for us, we have always believed—and have always *acted* on the belief—that we are indeed, all of us, our brothers' keepers.

We do not believe that, in order for some people to live well, others must go ill-fed, ill-housed, or ill-clothed. In this age of automation and accelerating technological progress, there is more than enough for everybody.

We have the resources, if we have the wit and the will, to purge the word "poverty" from our language. It is a big job—a job never before done or even attempted in any country in all the generations of man—but I am confident that we can do it.

We have made a solid start with the enactment of President Johnson's Economic Opportunity Act last month. And, now that we have begun the job, we shall stick with it to the finish.

A great poet and a good Democrat, Archibald MacLeish, has written that "America was promises."

So it has always been, from the beginning, for everyone who came to our shores from the older world. And I say with all humility, but with deep satisfaction, that we Democrats have done much to redeem these promises. Given the mandate of the American people—Independents and Republicans abandoned by their party leadership, as well as Democrats—we shall do more. We shall go forward in good heart and good conscience until we have created the Great Society—the "America the Beautiful" of which we have so often dreamed and sung.

This is our case, this our cause. And if we profit from the example of Harry S. Truman and take it to all the people, wherever they live—North, South, East, and West—I am confident that they will respond to this call in November.

Kansas City, Mo.
Press conference, Kansas City Airport
September 14, 1964

PRESS CONFERENCE OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. May we have your attention?

I am very proud to be in the attention of my good friend, the senior Senator from the State of Missouri, Senator Symington, and visit this great city of Kansas City.

I am also very pleased and proud to be present and in the company of the Democratic candidate for Governor, the gentleman that I trust that the people of Missouri will see fit to make the Governor of this State. I know that both the local and the national press may have some questions they would like to ask and without any further ado, I am available for questioning.

QUESTION. Senator, do you think that Senator Goldwater has killed or at least badly wounded the bipartisan foreign policy?

Senator HUMPHREY. The question from Mr. Piers Anderson is, do I think that Senator Goldwater has seriously wounded or killed the bipartisan foreign policy.

I am going to address myself to this subject tonight at the Music Hall in Kansas City. It is my view that his speech in Seattle was most unfortunate, that it was an affrontal assault upon the great strides that have been made in the development of a bipartisan foreign policy ever since the period of World War II. The speech was not only an attack upon foreign policy that is now being conducted by President Johnson, but indeed, an attack upon some of the great

Anderton



14 HHF

Republicans of our time who have contributed so much to bipartisan foreign policy on national security—men like Mr. Stimson, the late and beloved Arthur Vandenberg, men like Mr. Forrestal, President Eisenhower, and, of course, many others who have contributed so much to the national unity in terms of our security and foreign policy.

QUESTION. Senator, in a sermon yesterday, one of Washington's respected clergymen, Dean Sayre, said that the people have what is quoted as "a sterile choice between Goldwater and Johnson." He called one man a man of dangerous ignorance and devastating uncertainty and the other a man whose public house is splendid in its every appearance, but his private lack of ethic must inevitably introduce termites at the very foundation. I wonder what comment you would have to that statement of Dean Sayre, sir.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I know the dean and I surely respect him as one of the great spiritual leaders of our country. I seldom try to put myself in judgment on these matters when our clergy speaks out. I do feel that not only is the public house of America in good order, but knowing our President as I do and knowing his family as I do, and as I am sure many others do, and life and the works of President Johnson and his family have been dedicated to the well-being of this country. In fact, a great sacrifice has been made in terms of personal life and personal happiness for the public good.

I find the President to be a man of good health politically, spiritually, and physically.

QUESTION. Senator Humphrey, Senator Goldwater has made his Cuban policy, some fundamentals of his Cuban policy, fairly clear. Can we expect if President Johnson gets the mandate of the people in November that there will be any stiffening of this policy or that we will carry along with it in the same respect of the blockade and other aspects of it that were primarily set up by President Kennedy.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, the policy of the this Government relating to any adversary or any trouble spot is not a partisan matter. The policy which is being pursued now on Cuba is one that has had its genesis first in the Eisenhower administration and then in the period of President Kennedy's executive leadership, and now with President Johnson.

I don't really believe that much good will come out of a partisan discussion of Cuban policy, because once that starts, there are many charges and countercharges that can be made. I could name some now, but I will not.

I will simply say that the policy which is being pursued is one that preserves peace in the hemisphere, that has seriously weakened Castro's regime in Cuba, and that has stopped Castro's influence in the rest of Latin America.

Castro's influence was tried in Venezuela, in Mexico, in Chile, in Brazil, in the Argentine, and in every place, it was a failure, primarily because of the leadership of the United States and our partners in the Organization of American States.

QUESTION. Senator, Congressman Tom Curtis, of Missouri, said in Kansas City today that the issue of morality in government would be the prime issue of the campaign, and he raised a charge that the Johnson administration had been guilty of covering up rather than cleaning up. Do you have any comment on that, sir?

Senator HUMPHREY. My comment is that that is the kind of politics that one would expect at this season of the year. This is really not much news. I had expected this charge.

This administration is going to ferret out any wrongdoing wherever it may be; in fact, I am sitting alongside of a distinguished Senator that ferreted out a good deal of wrongdoing in the previous administration.

This administration has directed the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which is a totally nonpartisan, very effective instrument of investigation under the direction of J. Edgar Hoover, to examine into any charge or allegation of wrongdoing any place in this Government. And when those investigations are made and completed, the responsible agencies of Government can go before a grand jury and seek an indictment if there is wrongdoing.

dangerous

(disregard) X
~~ethics~~ X

15 HHF

I have a feeling that J. Edgar Hoover knows more about investigations than any Congressman and maybe will do a more honorable and a more objective and a more nonpolitical job. So we will just trust the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Justice Department, and the Internal Revenue Service and the other agencies of Government that are under civil service, and the courts of this land and the prosecuting attorneys of this land, to protect the so-called public morality. I think they will do a better job than a Congressman or a Senator in a campaign year.

QUESTION. Senator Humphrey, I believe Senator Williams has said that he does not anticipate any report from the FBI before the November election. Do you?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I hope that I heard you wrong. I understood that you said that Senator Williams—this is of Delaware?

QUESTION. He has been so quoted in the press.

Senator HUMPHREY. That he did not expect any report from the FBI before the election?

QUESTION. This is the report I read on the news wire, sir.

Senator HUMPHREY. I simply do not believe that J. Edgar Hoover is going to pay any attention to the election date, and I never yet heard that anybody has accused Mr. Hoover of playing partisan politics. I think there is no evidence to that, and I doubt that Mr. Williams meant it seriously. He is occasionally a practical joker.

QUESTION. Senator Humphrey, we have heard a lot of comment about the white backlash. How serious a threat do you consider this to the Democratic ticket in November?

Senator HUMPHREY. I don't consider it a very serious threat. I consider it a matter of concern; but I think that once the people understand the issues that are before us, once they fully understand that whoever is President of this Nation must take an oath to uphold the law and to enforce the law, including the Civil Rights Act, that people will then review the whole spectrum of the political issues of our day.

There has been much more talk about the so-called backlash than there has been fact. I noticed that in a number of areas that have been surveyed where people are distressed over what they consider to be some excesses in terms of violence and rioting, nevertheless, they support President Johnson. And I think that most Americans are fair if given the chance to be fair, madam, and they want to do what is right.

I hope that the spokesman of the opposition will encourage us to do what is right as we of this party, the Democratic Party, should encourage people to do what is right.

In other words, what I am saying is that we ought to encourage observance of the law, respect for the law, and above all, respect for each other. And that means for everybody.

QUESTION. Senator, he said in Minneapolis the other night that the administration is encouraging racial violence through its attempts to legislate morality. What do you think of that correlation?

Senator HUMPHREY. Do I understand you to say—who said that?

QUESTION. Senator Goldwater said it in Minneapolis.

Senator HUMPHREY. Senator Goldwater said that the administration is—

QUESTION. Encouraging racial violence.

Senator HUMPHREY. As I recall, sir, so that the question may be known by our listeners and viewers, you are saying that Senator Goldwater indicated, or said that the administration is encouraging racial violence. Is that correct?

I doubt that is what Senator Goldwater said. I think what he said was that the Civil Rights Act has encouraged violence and bitterness. And, of course, I disagree with him on that.

I regret that the Senator has seen fit to attempt to make political capital out of one of the great national problems and national challenges of our time. It is not easy for people to change their habits, nor is it easy for a country to change patterns of conduct such as in the field of civil rights, where we now have a law at the Federal level on public accommodations, fair employment practices. But we will make these changes if given time and given the opportunity to do so. And it ill behooves a candidate for President to indicate that a Federal statute, that was passed by an overwhelming majority of both Republicans and Democrats, after long debate, after serious consideration,

16 HMF

after rallying the support of all the great religious organizations of this Nation—everyone—Catholic, Protestant and Jew—that such law encourages bitterness and violence, I think, is—well, it is a travesty upon decency and justice.

Mr. Goldwater knows better than that and he ought not to talk that way. He ought to join President Johnson in saying that the law needs to be respected and observed and ask people to do just that.

QUESTION. Senator Humphrey, what is your reaction to the New York City groups that are boycotting schools today and presumably tomorrow because of the busing schedule they say, because it destroys the neighborhood school concept?

Senator HUMPHREY. I am not familiar with all the details of a particular local situation, but I can say, so that the record will be straight, that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 does not ask for busing of students; in fact, to the contrary.

There is a proviso in the act saying that the act shall not be applied for the purpose of busing students from one district to another. What we seek is the elimination of segregation, and we seek to provide for the development of better communities.

These matters that you refer to are problems of local nature to which the Federal law has no effect. In fact, the Federal law precludes any action on the part of the Federal Government in this area.

My own personal view is that we should improve the quality of our neighborhoods. I personally do not feel that we ought to be giving students long distance rides at the expense of families and students. But I do think we ought to build decent communities so that people have a chance to live a normal life, including a school life.

QUESTION. Senator, Senator Goldwater's campaign manager said in Omaha recently that he thought the political battle or the election would be won in the Midwest. Do you think this is true?

Senator HUMPHREY. You have indicated by your question that Senator Goldwater's campaign manager thought the elections would be won or lost in the Midwest. If that is the case, I am happy that I am in Missouri. Because, may I say that in Missouri, men like Senator Symington, Gov. John Dalton, and Warren Hearne and Bill Hull, and others that I can think of—Senator Ed Long—I would just like to make this the battleground if they want to. I think that Missouri will stand well in the final outcome, just as it did in 1960.

As I recall, Stuart, Minnesota and Missouri voted for John F. Kennedy, and in 1964, I can assure you that Minnesota, and I am sure Missouri, too, will vote for Lyndon B. Johnson.

I might add that I am of the opinion, too, that in Kansas City, this great district that I am visiting, that they will be voting for Dick Bolling, too, and sending him back to Congress.

QUESTION. Can you tell us, Senator, whether on this campaign tour, you have been in contact with the President and what he might have said to you?

Senator HUMPHREY. I have not been in contact with the President. I will be as soon as I return on Tuesday morning. But during this tour, no.

QUESTION. Thank you very much, Mr. Senator.

CONVERSATION BETWEEN FORMER PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN AND SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, IN THE MUEHLEBACH HOTEL, KANSAS CITY, MO., ON SEPTEMBER 14, 1964

Senator HUMPHREY. We were afraid that this would be the only way they would get a chance to see you.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is awfully nice of you to go to so much trouble. Let me put on these other spectacles.

Senator HUMPHREY. Mr. Atkins said he wanted to be sure those are the ones that had lenses in them.

Mr. TRUMAN. They wouldn't have any luck with me if they didn't have.

You see, the difference those are made especially so they don't make a reflection for these birds that have to use cameras—the "One More Club," I call them.

17 HMF

Senator HUMPHREY. I am beginning to find out a little bit more about that.

Mr. TRUMAN. Do you know how the "One More Club" was organized?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, Mr. President, I think this is a good time to start to ask you a few of the basic essentials that a candidate for Vice President ought to have. How was the "One More Club" organized?

Mr. TRUMAN. You have all the qualifications; you don't need any more instructions from me.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, I do; yes, sir.

Mr. TRUMAN. The only thing I know is just to be what you are and you won't need any help. That is the best selection that ever was made for Vice President.

Senator HUMPHREY. I thank you. That is a great compliment.

Mr. TRUMAN. I have known Vice Presidents from the time of Grover Cleveland on down and we have never had a better candidate for Vice President of the United States than you are.

Senator HUMPHREY. I thank you, Mr. President.

How does it look in Missouri here for the ticket?

Mr. TRUMAN. Well, I don't know. I don't think we are going to win by more than 250,000.

Senator HUMPHREY. About that?

Well, we will be willing to settle for that, Mr. President.

Mr. TRUMAN. No, Missouri is all right. You needn't worry about the State of Missouri going the way it ought to. It will go overwhelmingly for the Democratic ticket as it always does when it has half a chance.

The thing that worries me, though, is what I hear about southeast Missouri. When Jim Reaves goes haywire, I don't know what we are going to do. I think I will have to throw him in the Mississippi River and pull him out and make him vote for the ticket.

Senator HUMPHREY. That will help him.

How do you think we are going to do, Mr. President, in the South? You are a good judge of politics.

Mr. TRUMAN. I don't think you are going to have any serious trouble at all in the South. I can't see any place in the South, and I am rather familiar with the situation in most of the Southern States—they will do a lot of talking. And when it comes time to vote, they go into the polls and think, "Well, I can't afford to do that, my daddy will turn over in his grave," so they vote the Democratic ticket. That is what they will do this time.

Senator HUMPHREY. That is the best reassurance, and I want to thank you for it.

Mr. TRUMAN. It is true. That is what I believe, as sure as I sit here.

Senator HUMPHREY. I have felt that from a number of southern leaders that have been up to Washington. They have their problems and are concerned about many things, but the Democratic Party has been good to the South and the South has been good to the Democratic Party.

Mr. TRUMAN. And the South wouldn't have anything at all if it weren't for the fact that they belong to the Democratic Party. There is one thing about it. I don't think you have to worry about what they will do. I have had a lot of experience with them and they are all of the sort that remember things that they ought to remember. And that is that they can't afford to be Republican, because if the Republicans had their way, there wouldn't have been any South.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, now, Mr. President, speaking about our friend in the Republican Party, one of the things that I have noticed on this trip is a goodly number of Republicans come up to me, or people say to me, "I am a Republican but I am going to vote for President Johnson."

Do you feel that we are going to get a sizable Republican vote because of the Goldwater nomination?

18 HHHF

Mr. TRUMAN. Oh, yes, I do. Goldwater's speech that he made for the acceptance of the nomination ought to be good for any Democrats.

Senator HUMPHREY. The acceptance thing?

Mr. TRUMAN. Yes; it was terrible. I thought all those people of that viewpoint had passed away long ago, but he is trying to revive a situation that does not exist, that is all.

Senator HUMPHREY. You are familiar with his speech out in Seattle, when he attacked our foreign policy?

Mr. TRUMAN. Yes, indeed. That is one of the things I can't understand. You know—I don't know whether you remember it or not, but a young man from Minnesota, who was a Republican at that time and a Congressman, and myself, went to every State in the middle of the Union and discussed a bipartisan foreign policy—not nonpartisan, bipartisan foreign policy. It was overwhelmingly passed by the Congress of the United States after that.

What he is trying to do is to put the foreign policy on the boards for a lot of trouble during the election. It shouldn't be done. Foreign policy ought to be a policy that represents the United States as a whole and not any political party. And that is what we have had ever since the 1930's.

Senator HUMPHREY. And you, sir, in your administration immediately following the war, established the line of bipartisan foreign policy with Arthur Vandenberg and some of the great Republican leaders at that time.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is exactly right.

Senator HUMPHREY. That is what we are going to try to maintain.

Mr. TRUMAN. It must be maintained and I think that is what you are for and you must do everything to see that it is maintained, because you are the Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States.

Senator HUMPHREY. I look forward to that day.

How do you think our President is doing?

Mr. TRUMAN. He is doing fine.

Senator HUMPHREY. He is, isn't he?

Mr. TRUMAN. Yes, he couldn't do any better. He is a very able and brilliant man.

Senator HUMPHREY. Very well experienced.

Mr. TRUMAN. I think so.

Senator HUMPHREY. Of course, you had the chance to know him real well, not only through your personal knowledge of him, but through your old friend, Sam Rayburn.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is correct. I knew him when he was in the Congress of the United States and I was there, too, part of the time. I know him very well. He is a very able and efficient public servant. That is what you want.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, Mr. President, I have not often had the opportunity to be in the role of some of these fine newspapermen and radio and TV commentators that we have before you, but I sort of enjoy just asking the questions, particularly when I am having a chance to ask the champ some questions.

Mr. TRUMAN. Well, you give me too much credit, but I appreciate it.

Senator HUMPHREY. Not at all.

How do you think we ought to be campaigning? Do you think we are doing the right thing or do you have some good advice for us?

Mr. TRUMAN. I think you are campaigning in the right direction and that you ought to stand on the platform of the Democratic Party, which is an excellent one, and you can't go wrong.

Senator HUMPHREY. Carry on the battle?

Mr. TRUMAN. That is right. Carry the battle to them. Don't let them bring it to you. Put them on the defensive. And don't ever apologize for anything. Don't let anybody put you on the defensive.

Senator HUMPHREY. Today at Springfield, I opened up my campaign speech before a wonderful crowd, by the way—it was a magnificent group there—and cited that 1948 experience when everybody, all the pundits and political commentators, thought you had had it, so to speak. But when you awakened the next morning, you had the prize—you were the President of the United States. I warned all our good friends here that even with all these polls being good for us, not to become complacent.

19 HHF

Mr. TRUMAN. Not at all. Just act like they don't exist. I never pay any attention to polls. If I had I wouldn't have been elected.

Senator HUMPHREY. You are so right. That is the advice I try to give all—

Mr. TRUMAN. Look at these fellows grin.

Senator HUMPHREY. I don't think we ought to take any more of your time.

Mr. TRUMAN. It is not my time, it is yours that you are wasting, because they are waiting upstairs to hear you speak.

Senator HUMPHREY. Oh, no, we are going to do a little speaking over at the Music Hall and I am going to tell them a little bit about how you constructed that great bipartisan foreign policy. I think the foreign policy and national security is your greatest achievement.

Mr. TRUMAN. I do, too, and I don't want to see it thrown out the window by a fellow who knows nothing about it. And your opponent doesn't.

Senator HUMPHREY. I think so, too.

Thank you very much.

Kansas City, Mo.

Municipal Auditorium

September 14, 1964 (advance release)

SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY

Last Wednesday was a sad day for America.

On that day in Seattle the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party offered his countrymen the first full-dress speech of his campaign on the subject of foreign policy.

Here was a chance for all of us—and for our friends, allies, and adversaries abroad—to take full measure of the man who aspires to the most powerful office in the world. Here was a chance to listen to his sober and responsible critique of 4 years of Democratic stewardship in foreign affairs, his alternatives to past policies, and his specific proposals for action in the 4 years ahead. Here was a chance for him to reassure the Nation and the free world by showing the wisdom, prudence, and responsibility so utterly essential to the American Presidency.

And what did we hear in Seattle?

We heard a violently intemperate assault on the integrity of all those who have helped to build our foreign policy in this infinitely dangerous and promising world. We heard slanderous charges of opportunism and cynicism so far reaching as to be believable only of monsters. We heard a grotesque and unrecognizable account of the past 4 years. And yet we heard not a single word about what he would have done in the past or what he would do in the future.

Saddest of all, we also heard in his words the onimous sound of a splitting rock—words indicating, that if he had his way, the mighty fortress of American bipartisanship in foreign affairs developed a deep crack.

For the words of Barry Goldwater were words that cut at the heart of American political history—nearly two decades of dynamic partnership between the two great political parties, a partnership that basically began at the water's edge with an end to petty politics as we united to face our tasks abroad.

In Seattle, Barry Goldwater did his best to destroy that partnership. Yet I doubt that he really succeeded—or that he can succeed. The American people know better. In his recklessness Barry Goldwater has taken on more than just the Democratic Party. He has flown in the face of history and reality. And he has assaulted the work of the giants of his own great party. The architects of bipartisanship—Henry L. Stimson, Wendell Willkie, Senator Arthur Vandenburg, John Foster Dulles, and Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Frankly, we had hoped for better things from the Republican candidate. Only a few weeks ago, you will remember, there was a summit meeting in Hershey, Pa., of both Republican Parties—the party of Eisenhower and the party of Goldwater. At this peace pow-wow Barry buried his hatchet—and announced his conversion to the foreign policy principles and record of the Eisenhower administration he had so often opposed when President Eisenhower was in office.

20 HHF

For one brief moment Republicans could hope that the sane and sensible policies that had commanded bipartisan support for so long might win the adherence of the Republican nominee in 1964. For one brief moment they could hope that Senator Goldwater would retract his impulsive threats, would turn from his crusade for extremism toward the sanity of moderation.

But then came Seattle—and out came the hatchet, all sharpened up for a wild bout of chopping at the U.S. ship of state.

In vain, then, were the hopes of moderate Republicans that the Hershey summit meeting had produced a new Goldwater. In vain, too, were the hopes millions of people—Democrats as well as Republicans—that Americans might be faced in this crucial election with a choice between two men of prudence and responsibility for the supreme office of President.

The sad fact of Seattle is that no such choice exists. For there is no new Goldwater. There is only that same old impulsive figure from never-never land of his own making—a land, as my distinguished colleague, Senator McCarthy, so eloquently put it, “In which the calendar has no years, in which the clock has no hands, and in which glasses have no lenses.”

Let me tell you one thing: That Seattle speech was an amazing performance. The temporary Republican spokesman went peering around the globe, seeing gloom and doom everywhere. He rounded up every foreign policy problem of the past 4 years that he could lay his hands on; and he divided them up into two little groups. As for the crises that were hard to describe as defeats for the United States—for instance, the Cuban missile confrontation of October 1962 and the Gulf of Tonkin crisis this summer—these, he complained, had been somehow cooked up by the administration for political purposes: Timed, staged, and delivered just to make trouble for Republicans. As for all the others, he said, they simply added up to a “record of international disaster.”

I ask just two questions: Where has Barry been for the past 4 years? And who is his eye doctor? Because—heaven knows—Barry needs help. He simply can't see very well.

Actually, Seattle showed that Barry knows he needs help, too. He told us that he was setting up a committee of advisers to help him understand the problems of foreign policy.

We can all be thankful. We wish these advisers well in their difficult assignment. These teachers have a real problem student; and they've got a problem teacher too. Who's the chief tutor of this cram course in foreign affairs?

Our old friend Dick Nixon.

Frankly, my friends, on the basis of his Seattle analysis, I submit that the Senator from Arizona knows little about the world beyond our shores, knows less about the record of the past 4 years, and knows virtually nothing about the serious conduct of foreign policy in a nuclear age.

Furthermore, I also submit that he has exceeded all bounds of truth and decency in his Seattle diatribe. For in the course of that speech Senator Goldwater charged that President Kennedy deliberately manipulated the Cuban missile crisis for partisan political gain.

Here, in this charge, the Republican nominee has struck a new low in his campaign of slander and smear. I know that the charge is false. Senator Goldwater may be naive about many things, but he is not naive about this. He has been in Washington for years. He knows how the great processes of government work in times of national crisis.

Apart from his own recent proposals to change the rules, he knows ultimate responsibility for life-and-death decisions belongs to the President. President Kennedy exercised that responsibility for all of us in October 1962.

What can we think of a man now aspiring to the Presidency of the United States who deliberately attacks the patriotism, honesty, and integrity of a recently martyred holder of that office? What can we think of a presidential candidate who smears with the brush of partisan politics the most fateful decision any President has made in this decade?

21 HHF

What can we think of a man who charges that a crisis involving the possible incineration of the Northern Hemisphere was handled on a political timetable? What can we think of a candidate who now slanders the reputation, after death, of a President whom he personally knew and hitherto respected? This reckless attack would be deplorable enough if it came from sheer lack of information. But in this case Senator Goldwater cannot be excused on grounds of ignorance and excessive political zeal. He is a member of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee which held exhaustive top-secret hearings in the spring of 1963 on every aspect of the Cuban missile crisis. He attended those hearings and questioned the witnesses. He did not dissent from the committee report. Senator Goldwater knows the full story of the Cuban missile crisis at a privileged level of detail.

A man sharing this platform tonight, the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri, Stuart Symington, who served with Senator Goldwater on that same Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, has assured me that the entire record of the crisis was presented to the committee—including all details on the exact moment when the photographs of the missiles were taken, who took them, where, and when. All this Senator Goldwater knows. Senator Symington's conclusion—which I believe is shared by all Members of the Senate who have access to the facts—is that Senator Goldwater's charge is false.

I cannot believe that this ill-advised charge reflects the conscience of a conservative. It is the raving of a desperate officeseeker.

I believe that all Americans—of any political party, of any section of the country—will resent this slander on the memory of John F. Kennedy and will reject the charge as false.

Yes, Seattle was a low point; but let us hope that we may now hear wiser words from our Republican opponent—about the great issues of foreign policy that do indeed confront us. These are issues that need to be discussed. But they deserve discussion on the basis of hard facts, not distortions.

And among those hard facts is the clear and undeniable record of U.S. foreign policy under the leadership of President Kennedy and President Johnson.

It is a record of which all Americans in both political parties can be enormously proud: A record of relentless dedication by gifted men of both parties in pursuit of a more peaceful world; dedication in strength, dedication in faith, dedication in wisdom.

Look back for a moment at the distance we have come since January 1961. In these dynamic 44 months—

We have vastly widened the gap between United States and Soviet strategic military power.

We have caught up with and surpassed the Soviets in space exploration.

We have greatly increased the massive economic superiority of the United States and the Western World over the Communist World.

We have taken the first step in history toward the control of nuclear weapons and the end of atmospheric poisoning through the conclusion of the test ban treaty.

We have diminished the danger of nuclear war through misunderstanding by the establishment of the hot line between Washington and Moscow.

We have met the crucial test of Soviet threats to the freedom of West Berlin—West Berlin today remains robust and free.

We have opened windows of light and air on the people of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union and have given new hope to those who live under communism.

We have responded with power, restraint, and precision to each Communist probe of our will and intentions—in Cuba, in Berlin, in Vietnam, and in the Gulf of Tonkin.

We have proven to our friends in Asia that our power remains preeminent and our devotion to freedom firm—and to our foes that the United States is no "paper tiger."

We have assisted the 400 million people of India to survive an attack from Communist China and enter with us into a program to prevent further Chinese aggression.

22 HHF

We have aided the extraordinary growth toward economic strength and maturity of Japan and the Republic of China.

We have worked with our neighbors of this hemisphere in the creation of an historic new partnership, the Alliance for Progress—and we have joined with them in the isolation, quarantine, and exclusion of Communist Cuba from the Inter-American Community.

We have broken new ground in trade legislation that can give even greater long-term strength and unity to the Atlantic Community.

Most significant of all, we have witnessed in these months—and we have treated with care and prudence—one of the greatest cataclysmic changes of modern history, a change that immeasurably aids the cause of freedom—the fantastic disruption and fragmentation of the Sino-Soviet empire.

This, then, is our record of the past 4 years.

Is this a “record of international disaster,” as Senator Goldwater tells us? Far from it. It is a record of solid progress—our Allies know it, our adversaries know it, and the American people know it.

Heaven knows we still have problems—we still have crises, and we will have them for a long time to come. For the path toward peace is long and slow and dangerous and tortuous. To walk that path in a nuclear age we need all the brains and skill and wisdom, all the wit and courage and compassion that we can find within us. Yet instead of such qualities, the temporary Republican spokesman is offering us a substitute, a new instrument of foreign policy—the freeswinging meat ax.

The world we live in is a dangerous world: A world darkened by nuclear weapons and a spiraling armaments race, a world darkened by the sinister attempts of communism to seize control of nations and their destinies, and the minds of men. It is not a world for men of timid spirit. It is a world where passions and conflict and danger cause difficulty for men and nations everywhere.

But it is also a world of promise. We are at the threshold, as never before, of an age when mankind can feed its hungry, clothe and house its needy, bring care and cure to the suffering and the sick, bring justice to the oppressed, bring literacy and learning and opportunity to those who hope.

And we are beginning—slowly, carefully, painstakingly—to reach for that promise, to move across that threshold. We are learning that individual burdens can be lifted if national burdens can be shared. We have begun here at home, to work towards that Great Society for which all men yearn in their heart of hearts. But the ideal and reality of the Great Society is not the private domain of Americans alone. In the years ahead, we can begin to help create an expanding Great Society abroad—in our Atlantic and Pacific communities, and in the less-developed continents.

How shall we do these things—the great tasks that lie before us? Under the leadership of a man who vilifies the past, distorts the present, and shrinks from the future—who lives to curse the darkness and never sees the light?

We Americans are children of light—let us put from us forever the children of darkness.

We have today in the highest office of our land a man who understands our world—its dangers and its promise. We have a man of courage, prudence, and compassion—a man who has been tested as few men in our history: By public service under four Presidents, by leadership in the Congress of the United States, by sudden elevation under tragic and dreadful circumstances to the White House itself.

It is especially appropriate that we should speak of such a man and such qualities here in Kansas City. For this is the home country of another great American of similar qualities who did so much to guide our land and the free world through times of crisis and epochmaking decisions. Wherever creative statesmanship and dynamic bipartisanship in foreign affairs are honored, there will men honor the name of Harry S. Truman.

It is a depressing thought, but in the weeks ahead we must remember that the temporary spokesman for the Republican Party could become the President of the United States. He could be in a position to

23 HHF

reverse the global gains of Harry S. Truman, John F. Kennedy, and Lyndon B. Johnson.

But only if we let him win.

He could be in a position to withdraw the United States from the United Nations—one of mankind's best hopes for freedom since its founding in the days of Harry S. Truman.

But only if we let him.

He could have his finger—or that of some field commander—on the nuclear trigger.

But only if we let him.

He could be in a position to destroy the foreign aid program, one of the pillars of American security since the Marshall plan of Harry S. Truman sparked the recovery of Europe.

But only if we let him.

He could be in a position to destroy the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty which has halted the pollution of the atmosphere.

But only if we let him.

But I know and you know that we shall not let him win.

As for myself I promise you that I shall leave nothing undone, no mile untraveled, no word unspoken that will help defeat Senator Goldwater, that will help keep responsibility and maturity in the White House.

Few men have ever risen so rapidly to the challenge of history—and with such success—as Harry S. Truman and Lyndon Johnson.

No man today is more superbly qualified to lead our Nation and the world toward the noble goals of the Great Society than our President.

I ask you tonight to pledge your hearts—and your votes in November—to our President, Lyndon Baines Johnson.

[Telegram]

WASHINGTON, D.C.

MIKE MCKOOL,

General Chairman, North Texas Appreciation Dinner for Senator Ralph Yarborough, Sheraton Dallas, Grand Ballroom, Dallas, Tex.:

Wish I could be with you tonight to express my deep appreciation and fond regard for my good friend and one of America's greatest Senators, Ralph Yarborough. No Senator brings a finer mind, a more compassionate heart, or stronger determination to the Senate. No higher praise could come to him than the words of President Johnson when he said, "Texas has never had a Senator who voted for the people more than Ralph Yarborough has," for Texas, for the Senate, for the Nation, I urge you to redouble your efforts to reelect Senator Yarborough, the eyes of the Nation are on you.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,

U.S. Senator.

Article

Congressional Record

September 15, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, REAPPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES AMENDMENT, U.S. SENATE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the minute that remains I should like to underscore what I believe is involved in the amendment offered by my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], and myself, and which I know is widely supported by other Senators.

First, the amendment would protect the integrity of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, it would protect the integrity of the Senate as a parliamentary body.

24 HHF

Second, it would protect the integrity of the Court in its responsibility under our Constitution to interpret and apply the constitutional provisions.

Third, it would respect the doctrine of the separation of powers between the different branches of our Government.

Finally, the amendment is one of reason. It would express the sense of the Senate, asking that the Court take into consideration some of the factors which are involved in the time that is necessary for reapportionment by the State legislative bodies. It also takes into consideration the possibility of a constitutional amendment.

I hope that the question may now be decided by an affirmative vote for the amendment.

Article

Congressional Record
September 16, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, RURAL HOUSING PROGRAM, U.S. SENATE

RURAL HOUSING PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, our Nation needs to move at a faster pace in wiping out the slums that exist in rural America. We take pride in the fact that in the past 4 years we have revitalized and greatly expanded the rural housing program of the Farmers Home Administration. But we must redouble our efforts.

Since 1961 the Farmers Home Administration has loaned \$450 million to rural people so they might have modern homes in which to live. But we should be extending that much credit every year.

More than a million rural families still live in homes that are a menace to their health and safety.

During the fifties, when we should have been attacking this problem with all our force, the activities of the Farmers Home Administration were throttled. In fact, for a time, the rural housing program was discontinued.

Now we have to make up for lost time.

Recently the Congress authorized \$150 million to continue the housing program of the Farmers Home Administration for another year.

Before 12 months pass we must enact legislation that will really move us toward the goal of a decent home for every rural American. Perhaps this can be done by expanding the current insured loan program of the Farmers Home Administration, a program that utilizes funds obtained from private investors to help family farmers improve their farms and help rural communities develop water systems. I introduced a bill last year for this purpose and am hopeful it will receive Senate consideration prior to adjournment.

The agency is experienced, the need is obvious, the method is well tested—losses are only one one-hundredth of 1 percent of the funds advanced. All that is needed is an adequate system of providing the needed funds.

An excellent article by Leland DuVall in the Arkansas Gazette calls rural housing "the forgotten orphan in the private-public program that has enabled the United States to become the best housed Nation in the world." In suggesting steps that can be taken to modernize all rural homes, Mr. DuVall tells of the need for improving the housing of farm laborers as well as other rural families. We have every reason to believe that the recently enacted Omnibus Housing Act of 1964, with its provisions for Federal financial assistance to rural groups that want to build better homes for farm laborers, will do much to help eliminate the shacks that too often pass for housing in areas where migrant laborers harvest the crops. The new legislation will enable the Farmers Home Administration to contribute up to two-thirds of the cost of farm labor housing.

Broadening the small watershed program

Mr. DuVall, in the September 6 edition of the Arkansas Gazette, also discussed another important subject—a proposal made by Representative Wilbur Mills, of Arkansas, for broadening the small watershed program.

25 HHF

Mr. President, I have been a longtime advocate of the watershed approach to soil and water conservation in America. It provides for a combined effort of local, State, and Federal organizations and agencies to team up for community improvement. The key to the success of the small watershed program has been the fact the individual projects are started at the local level and are carried out under local leadership.

During the past 10 years the Congress has broadened and made Public Law 566 more useful at least four times. I call to the attention of fellow Senators this proposal for further broadening the legislative authority for the small watershed program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the Record Mr. DuVall's article on rural housing and his column on the small watershed program.

CBS NEWS,
Washington, D.C.

"FACE THE NATION" AS BROADCAST OVER THE CBS TELEVISION NETWORK AND THE CBS RADIO NETWORK, SEPTEMBER 16, 1964

Guest: The Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey (Minnesota), Democratic nominee for Vice President.

News correspondents: Paul Niven, CBS News; John L. Steele, Time, Inc.; Martin Agronsky, CBS News.

Producers: Prentiss Childs and Ellen Wadley.

Director: Robert Vitarelli.

ANNOUNCER. The following program is brought to you as part of the continuing coverage by CBS News of "Campaign 1964, the Presidential Election Year."

From Washington, D.C., Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democratic candidate for Vice President, will "Face the Nation."

In a spontaneous and unrehearsed news interview, Senator Humphrey will be questioned by CBS News Correspondent Martin Agronsky; John L. Steele, Washington bureau chief of Time, Inc.

To lead the questioning, here is CBS News Correspondent Paul Niven.

MR. NIVEN. Senator, welcome to "Face the Nation."

You have been out campaigning in eight States now, criticizing Senator Goldwater as the temporary Republican spokesman, and appealing to Republicans to join Democrats in reelecting President Johnson.

In the meantime, the Republicans, including your own opponent, Congressman Miller, have been attacking you as a radical.

We have questions about both campaigns, and we will begin in just 1 minute.

Senator Humphrey, the Republicans have been criticized for tagging you with certain policies of the Americans for Democratic Action with which you personally do not agree.

Well, now, if Senator Goldwater is going to be held responsible for the views of the John Birch Society, of which he is not even a member, why shouldn't Republicans identify you with an organization of which you have been an officer for 14 years?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, Mr. Niven, I have never held Mr. Goldwater responsible for the views of the John Birch Society. I have a difficult enough time holding Mr. Goldwater responsible for his own views. Those views are so conflicting at times, it is rather difficult to even keep account of them.

But Senator Humphrey does not say that Senator Goldwater is a Birchite, he doesn't say that he subscribes to the John Birch platform, he doesn't accuse him of being a member of the John Birch Society because I am sure he is not. But what I do feel is that Senator Goldwater's views are not good for America, and that if he were elected President of the United States, that it would not serve our national interest, nor would it serve the cause of peace.

26 HHF

Mr. AGRONSKY. There seems to be a certain conflict, Senator, between the position that the ADA has taken on some matters and the foreign policy of this administration, Cuba being one example.

The ADA wants Cuba brought back into the Organization of American States, the OAS. The administration has made it very clear it does not. Where do you stand on this matter?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, Mr. Agronsky, the Americans for Democratic Action is an open organization, its membership is open—its membership is open, its meetings are open, it is exactly what it says it is, an American organization for democratic action. It is no conspiracy, it is no closed society, it wears no nightshirts, and it has no secret meetings.

Mr. AGRONSKY. I didn't imply that, sir.

Senator HUMPHREY. No—I just wanted to get that record straight on ADA.

Many of us that have been members and are members—for example, Elmer Davis, one of the great commenators of our networks, and you gentlemen knew him well, a great patriot of our country, was a charter member of Americans for Democratic Action. Stewart Alsop, charter member. Rheinold Niebuhr, the great theologian, charter member.

Now, these men all held individual views. And in that organization you can hold individual views.

In reference to the Cuba situation, as I recall—I know what my view is. Cuba is a menace to this hemisphere. I have called for the sternest action in terms of the quarantine of Cuba, economic and political: called for the Organization of American States to censure Cuba, to impose economic sanctions upon Cuba, just as other democratic leaders—President Betancourt of Venezuela, and others, have called for this.

ADA has asked for the restoration of free government in Cuba, supports this government's policies of economic sanctions in Cuba, but has said—and I think somewhat idealistically—that if Cuba could arrive at a position of nonalignment, if it would quit its program of subversion, that then it should be readmitted to the Organization of American States. Well, I don't think Cuba is going to quit its program of subversion. It has got a subversive—

Mr. AGRONSKY. If they did, would you agree with that objective?

Senator HUMPHREY. No, I would not. I do not believe in including in the Organization of American States a Communist country.

Mr. STEELE. Senator Goldwater, Senator Humphrey, charged today, I believe, in Des Moines, that since 1960 the Democratic administration hasn't lived up to one single promise it made the American farmer. For instance, he recalls that your party promised to raise farm income, but that in fact the parity ratio is at its lowest level since 1939, and that it is down 10 points since the Eisenhower era.

What have you got to say to this charge?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, Mr. Steele, for Mr. Goldwater to be talking about American agriculture and to indicate that he has an interest in the American farmer is like putting a fox in charge of the chicken coop.

This really is—this is ironical, it is paradoxical, it is almost humorous, unless it were so tragic.

Senator Goldwater has voted against every single farm program that has been advanced before the Congress of the United States since he has been in the Congress relating to the protection and the help of American agriculture. This includes rural electrification, it includes farm price supports, it includes the extension of an expansion of farm credit.

Now, this administration has done many things in agriculture.

First of all it had to redeem much of the chaos that came from the Benson era of agricultural policy.

We have increased farm income by over one—I won't say we have. Let us put it this way. Farm income, under the Kennedy-Johnson administration has increased in net over \$1 billion. The farmer today, in terms of his family income, has a much better income than he had 4 years ago.

meetings

X

27 HHF

I don't say we have done well enough. But, my gracious, for Senator Goldwater who admits—as he said, “I know nothing about farming”—that's what he said. For him to criticize us on agriculture is really almost beyond what I would call human comprehension.

Mr. STEELE. Well, Senator, I realize that you are sort of going on the counterattack there. But he did make a series of very specific charges. Now, he charged that the Democratic platform of 1960 promised to help in balancing farm production with the expanding needs of the Nation.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, sir.

Mr. STEELE. But he also charges that the Commodity Credit Corporation investments, the amount of money in loans they put in farm commodities, is up, not down—that it is up over \$84 million over what it was when your party took over in 1960. What about this?

Senator HUMPHREY. I would say, number one, that Mr. Goldwater is wrong. We have fewer farm surpluses today than we had in 1960. We have millions of bushels less in feed grains. We have thousands of bales less in cotton. We have hundreds of millions of bushels less in wheat. And what Mr. Goldwater is referring to is the fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation has had to be reimbursed for many of the sales under the food-for-peace program, which is a part of the total cost of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. STEELE. Well, on this feed grain matter, he also said that surplus feed grains are being carried into the new crop year at a rate which is 10 percent above that previously pertaining.

Senator HUMPHREY. Now, Mr. Goldwater is just patently wrong, Mr. Steele.

When we entered into the administration of President Kennedy, we had the largest accumulation of feed grains that the world had ever known. And that feed grain stock has been reduced by hundreds of millions of bushels. And anybody that knows the difference between a ukelele and a turnip knows that that is a fact.

Mr. STEELE. Senator, are you ready to defend the Democratic farm program? Is this a good program that you are satisfied with?

Senator HUMPHREY. It is a better program than that that has been offered by the Republicans, and it is a much better one than Mr. Goldwater has ever offered, because his votes have been negative. And it is the program which I believe needs considerable improvement.

Mr. NIVEN. Senator, I want to get back to ADA for a moment. You explained there were diversions of view in the organization, and you have explained that you did not agree with it on Cuba. I am sure you do not agree also with its suggestion that we consider de facto recognition of East Germany. I know that you don't agree with it on negotiations leading to U.N. admission of China because you belong also to the Committee of One Million whose whole purpose is against that.

Senator HUMPHREY. You are surely right.

Mr. NIVEN. But the question arises—if you disagree with ADA on so many fundamental points of foreign policy and points, furthermore, which invite criticism from your political opponents, why have you stayed in the organization all these years?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, first of all, this organization performed a very valuable function which we all ought to be grateful for; namely, it was an anti-Communist organization that helped clean out in some of what we call the liberal forces of America Communist infiltration.

Mr. NIVEN. Didn't that function disappear about 15 years ago?

Senator HUMPHREY. No, I think that you have to be ever on guard, Mr. Niven. Secondly, it is an independent political organization that has an opportunity to discuss political issues without the kind of rigid discipline that frequently comes within a political party.

It has a vast galaxy of issues that it is interested in. I have here before me a table of contents of its letter to the Platform Committee of the Democratic National Convention. There are 27 different items. For example, it strongly supports NATO; it strongly supports the United Nations; it strongly supports American presence in West Berlin; it strongly supports SEATO; it strongly supports the Alliance for Progress. It is vigorously anti-Communist.

28 HHF

So you see—the differences that one might have, for example, in reference to Communist China—it does not recommend the present admission of Communist China nor the present recognition, so let's clear it up.

Mr. NIVEN. Well, Senator, some of its leaders deserted Mr. Truman in 1948; President Kennedy said of ADA "I never feel comfortable with those people"; and the organization circulated an anti-Lyndon Johnson document at your last convention, the convention before last, in 1960.

Well, now, isn't the organization serving the Republicans more usefully as a target than it is serving the Democrats as an ally?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, there have been times when we have all been a little distressed with some of the criticisms of ADA. But let me say possibly it acts as a rather wholesome influence by being willing to criticize not only the conservative or the reactionary Republican, like Mr. Goldwater, but occasionally calling to task even a good Democrat. I think that kind of an organization can perform a reasonably good function.

Now, there is another organization known as the Americans for Constitutional Action. They keep a sort of a roll call on everybody. They represent a legitimate conservative point of view. They are the counterpart of ADA.

Many members of the Congress of the United States have been honored by that organization, getting medals and medallions and plaques for having had a very good conservative record.

I don't criticize the organization. It has a function to perform.

But I venture to say that many who are members of it and who have received their honors have occasionally disagreed with them.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Senator Humphrey, there have been some very strong attacks made by Congressman Miller and by Senator Goldwater on the ethics and the honesty of the President of the United States. The President himself has not chosen to respond to these. In addition to the attacks of Senator Goldwater and Mr. Miller, just Sunday a clergyman in this city, Dean Sayre, of the National Cathedral, a man of, I am sure, would agree, very high reputation, made a very, very critical attack on both the President and on Senator Goldwater.

He said one party is dominated by a single man, "a man of dangerous ignorance and devastating uncertainty" and he meant there the Republican nominee:

The other is a man whose public house is splendid in its every appearance, but whose private lack of ethic must inevitably introduce termites at the very foundation.

How would you respond to that, sir?

Senator HUMPHREY. I regret very much that Dean Sayre said that. I don't agree with him. I have the highest regard for this distinguished churchman. I think he is one of the finest men in our country.

I don't think the President of the United States needs to make any defense of either his public or private life.

After all, in American politics what is private is generally pretty public.

None of us are without sin. I haven't met any man that ran on the sainthood ticket.

And I am just getting a little weary of the constant attack being made, for example, as you indicated in the beginning, of the opposition on all the personal matters, upon all of these charges that are constantly brought up about radicalism or about improprieties when there are so many fundamental issues that need to be discussed.

I would like to find out, for example, just what are the views of the respective candidates on matters of foreign trade; what are the views of the candidates in the United States on matters of the improvement of education; what are the views of the candidates, for the Presidency on the matters of strengthening the United Nations.

There are matters that really ought to be discussed, Mr. Agronsky, but they are not getting that discussion.

Mr. AGRONSKY. I wouldn't deny any of that, Senator Humphrey. Nevertheless, certainly the character of a public leader, of a man who occupies high office in this country, as it is reflected in his ethics, his morality, his integrity, is a legitimate matter of public discussion.

(insert) you



29 HMF

Senator HUMPHREY. It is—and the President of the United States is a man of good health, physically, mentally, morally, and politically.

Mr. NIVEN. Well, Senator, the Republicans are clearly trying to portray him as a man who has, one, become rich, and two, risen to the pinnacle of political power as a sort of wheeler and dealer.

You have known Senator Johnson, Vice President Johnson for many years. Is he a wheeler and dealer?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, first of all let's talk about his matter of income. I never knew that Republicans were opposed to people making an honest profit if they had some business interests. I never thought that they were opposed to the capitalist system. I never thought they felt that a man ought to walk around in ashes and sackcloth. As long as this is made legitimately, and there has been no indication of anything illegitimate at all.

And as far as being a wheeler and dealer is concerned, the President of the United States has given his life to public service. He has been in the Congress and in the Senate, in the Vice-Presidency and now in the Presidency. Surely he has sought to be able to bring accommodation, so that we can pass bills. Any man that thinks that you can serve in the Congress of the United States and have it just your way and get something done is living in a fool's paradise.

I think the President of the United States is a man that knows how to bring about accommodation, how to develop a sense of unity, how to develop a sense of purpose.

I believe he is one of the most able, competent, gifted, talented, experienced political leaders that this Nation has ever had, and I am proud to be his friend, I am proud to be the citizen of a country over which he is the President, I am proud to be his running mate.

Mr. NIVEN. Well, Senator Humphrey, we have some questions on the war in South Vietnam and we will get to them in just 1 minute.

Mr. STEELE. Senator Humphrey, you wrote recently—and I want to quote you directly—that—

our direct involvement in southeast Asia should be gradually curtailed, and in the Far East our military-oriented program should be gradually scaled down.

Does this mean that you favor a policy of pullout or a negotiated settlement or what there?

Senator HUMPHREY. It surely does not. It means just exactly what it says: That the ultimate objective of American foreign policy is stability and independence and freedom in southeast Asia. And when that can be achieved, through the cooperation of the United States with loyal friends that have asked us for assistance—when that can be achieved, then indeed we should not maintain our military forces or our physical presence as a military power in southeast Asia.

We have no imperial design. But we have no intention of pulling out of South Vietnam. We are in there at the invitation of a government that is friendly. That invitation was extended in 1954, 10 years ago, under the administration of President Eisenhower. We are carrying out the same policy.

Mr. STEELE. Well, Senator, isn't it almost axiomatic that our military effort there and our commitment there will be increased under the current conditions of great instability rather than decreased?

Senator HUMPHREY. It may be necessary to have some modest increase in our military presence. As a matter of fact, there has been some over the past few years. I recall that some years ago we had less than 15,000 present in the area; I believe there are slightly more now, of American military manpower.

But this is a commitment to assist a government that has asked for help, a government that was guaranteed its neutrality and guaranteed its safety under international accords which have been violated by North Vietnam, violated by Communist subversion and Communist aggression.

We are trying our best to save that part of the world from becoming overwhelmed by Communist power.

30 HHF

Mr. STEELE. Senator, why doesn't the administration really level with the people? Now, look. Over the past few months the President, Secretary of Defense, Ambassador Taylor, almost every responsible spokesman has portrayed the effort there as on the upgrade, an improving situation.

We have had repeated coups and repeated lack of government stability in recent days, and apparently a deteriorating condition.

Why doesn't the Administration tell us the real facts about this?

Senator HUMPHREY. Mr. Steele, if there is any one part of the world that has been fully discussed before the American public and for the American public it is South Vietnam and southeast Asia.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Fully and frankly discussed?

Senator HUMPHREY. Fully and frankly discussed.

Mr. NIVEN. If that is true, Senator, why does the New York Times, a pro-Johnson newspaper, say:

The administration must honor its obligation to take the American people into its confidence regarding the true course of the complex conflict in South Vietnam.

Senator HUMPHREY. I think the administration has done that. I believe it has done that through all of our ambassadors, through ambassador Lodge, surely who is not a partisan to this administration. I think it has done it recently through the President of the United States, the late President John Kennedy, through former President Eisenhower—

Mr. NIVEN. Through Secretary McNamara?

Senator HUMPHREY. Through Secretary McNamara. We have never said that it was easy. The Secretary has reminded you again and again that this was a long ordeal.

Mr. NIVEN. Senator, Secretary McNamara said in January that the major part of the U.S. military task would be completed by the end of 1965.

Senator HUMPHREY. That was his hope. At the time it appeared that it could be, sir. But this is very much like any other part of the world. Changes do take place, and unexpected developments do occur.

Mr. STEELE. Much more recently than that one of the top administration spokesmen—I believe it was Ambassador Taylor on his return here just recently—portrayed the war on an upward swing. Do you really think it is on an upward swing?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, now, Mr. Steele, I was present when Ambassador Taylor spoke to the bipartisan group in the White House in the cabinet room, and all that Ambassador Taylor said was that he thought that the military situation was somewhat better than it had been before he had arrived.

Mr. STEELE. Do you believe

Senator HUMPHREY. I believe that. And he also said that the political situation was somewhat worse, which is a fact.

Now, what we seek to do is to improve the political situation.

There has been complete candor in terms of the dangers involved there, of the problems involved, of the long duration of the struggle, and of the desire of the American Government to seek stability and independence of the area so that we can, once that is achieved, seek to negotiate an honorable settlement.

Mr. STEELE. In complete candor, are there decisions being diverted now until after the conclusion of the political campaign?

Senator HUMPHREY. There are none, sir, that I know of, and I don't believe there are any that you have heard of, and none that anyone else has heard of. And that kind of talk, I might add, only adds to the confusion of American foreign policy and is the kind of talk, I regret to say, that the opposition has indulged in at the expense of the national security.

Mr. STEELE. I was asking you a question—

Mr. AGRONSKY. Senator—

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I wasn't responding to you so much, sir, as the nature of the argument that had been made in the Republican platform.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Senator, let's turn it around and make it a bit more specific and name names on it.

(delete "c")



31 HHF

Senator Goldwater has charged very specifically that the administration is guilty of manipulation for political purposes in South Vietnam. You have denounced this observation just last night—

Senator HUMPHREY. And now.

Mr. AGRONSKY. And now. I was with you when you made that very strong speech in Kansas City.

Now, I would like to ask this question.

Is perhaps the administration not necessarily guilty of manipulation, but guilty of nonmanipulation? Are we doing enough? Are we not permitting it to coast? Are we not sort of standing pat?

Many people feel, as Mr. Steele has indicated, that we are doing everything we can to kind of sit on the lid until the election, that we don't want anything to happen there, we are trying to mark time and hold on.

Is that unfair?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, Mr. Agronsky, it is my view that Senator Goldwater is manipulating what is developing and what has developed in Vietnam for his political purposes.

Let me say quite candidly in the very same address in which he accused President Johnson of manipulating matters in Vietnam for President Johnson's political purposes, he also accused the late President of the United States, John Kennedy, of having timed the Cuban missile crisis for the purposes of the election in November 1962.

Now, how shameful can you get? Everyone knows that is a falsehood. Every member of the Senate that has any sense of responsibility knows that that is not true.

John McCone, of the Central Intelligence Agency, and the top officials of our military testified under oath, in secret session, before the Senate Preparedness Committee, of which Senator Goldwater is a member. That record is available to members of the Senate. And he knows full well that the charges that he made in that Seattle speech are false, that they are beneath the dignity of the U.S. Senate, that they violate the published or the printed record of the U.S. Senate, and they violate the information of the U.S. Air Force, of which he is a Reserve general.

Mr. NIVEN. Senator, to back to Vietnam, if the record of the past 4 years were the record of a Republican administration, would you not, as a Democrat candidate, be drawing attention to the inconsistencies of official statements and criticizing that record?

Senator HUMPHREY. Listen, I am not opposed to any member of the Senate criticizing the fact that we have not done better in Vietnam. I am, however, very much upset by any charge that there is a manipulation of the matters in Vietnam for partisan political purposes.

This country is too important in the world, Mr. Niven, and our actions are too important to play partisan politics with international crises. We never have under any administration, and we don't intend to under this one. And I know of no responsible Democrat that ever accused Dwight Eisenhower of playing partisan politics with international crises.

We have criticized missiles, we have criticized lack of balance in the armed forces. But we have never accused the President of the United States of utilizing an international crisis that involved the safety of America and of the world for a partisan political purpose. And if we ever did, we ought to apologize, and I for one would never do it.

Mr. STEELE. Senator, if memory serves me correctly in 1960 you favored conducting the Kennedy-Nixon debates in legislation that made those debates possible.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, sir.

Mr. STEELE. Why did you vote to table or to kill legislation to make similar debates possible this year?

Senator HUMPHREY. In 1960, Mr. Nixon was not an incumbent President, nor was Mr. Kennedy. They were both candidates for office.

In this instance, gentlemen, one of the men is a President of the United States.

And I guess my best answer is, is what Barry Goldwater, Senator Goldwater said himself, I believe it was last February, when he said that he thought it would be very foolish for the President of the United States to engage in debate.

32 HHF

Mr. NIVEN. Senator, in a sentence, how many States will President Johnson and Senator Humphrey carry in November?

Senator HUMPHREY. I hope we carry enough, and we expect to. I really could not give you a number on it.

Mr. NIVEN. Thank you, Senator Humphrey, I am sorry our time is up. We will have a word about an interview with Congressman Miller 2 weeks from now in a moment.

ANNOUNCER. Today on Face the Nation, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, the Democratic candidate for Vice President was interviewed by CBS News correspondent Martin Agronsky; John L. Steele, Washington bureau chief of Time, Inc., and CBS News correspondent Paul Niven.

Wichita Falls, Tex.
Marchman Hotel
September 17, 1964

TRANSCRIPT OF PRESS CONFERENCE BY SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY, DEMOCRATIC VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE

Congressman Purcell, ladies and gentlemen of the press corps, it is one of the highest privileges of my life to present to you at this time the next Vice President of the United States, Senator Humphrey.

We are glad to have him here and I know you will be glad to hear what he has to say.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you. [Applause.]

Thank you very much, Congressman Purcell, and Senator Yarborough, my friends of the Wichita County Committee, and members of the press corps that are with us, and radio and television.

I am sure that what we are here for is some questions and I hope that I have some answers, so why don't we just proceed? Would you identify yourself? The lights are very bright and I have a difficult time seeing you.

Mr. FERGUSON. Pat Ferguson, Baltimore Sun.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, sir.

Mr. FERGUSON. What is your reaction to Senator Thurmond's defection to the Republican party?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, we Democrats all believe in freedom of choice and Mr. Thurmond has made a choice. I think he has made a bad one but his voting record in the Congress, which is entirely his right and I respect his right to exercise that right, is one that has been much closer to the voting record of Senator Goldwater than it has been to the policies of the administration.

At least, this makes it out in the open, and I notice that Senator Thurmond was again very candid when he said that he joined the Goldwater Republican party. There are at least two Republican parties at this time, the regular party and the Goldwater party, and we welcome to our rank the thousands and thousands of middle-of-the-road, moderate, progressive Republicans who see in President Johnson's administration an opportunity for a much better America, and I believe that the trade that is being made, with one going to the Goldwater Republican party and the hundreds of thousands coming to the Democratic party, is all in our favor.

Mr. DUSCHA. Yesterday—Julius Duschka, Washington Post—yesterday, Senator Goldwater suggested that Federal tax money should be given back to the States to do as they wish with, rather than being used as grants-in-aid. What is your view on this?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, as you know, the Council of Economic Advisors of the President has been studying the whole matter of the proper distribution and use of Federal revenues. The proposed suggestion of the council indicated some support for that measure, long before Senator Goldwater ever talked about it or thought about it, provided that the programs which the Federal Government has undertaken as a matter of national need and national would not be jeopardized, but what I gather is that Senator Goldwater is doing is the following. He wants to reduce taxes 25 percent; he wants to increase the Federal outlays approximately \$30 billion for new programs. Then he wants to give back to the States a large proportion of the remaining Federal revenues and cause this fiscal responsibility.

?
who is speaking?

X

(Comma)

(insert "indistinct")

economy

(period;
capital "I")

This is a spaghetti economic, at best. It is twisted and distorted and stringy and unrecognizable, I believe, so as far as fiscal policy is concerned. It would seem to me that the Senator would have been in much better stand if he had voted for a thoughtfully worked out, responsible, carefully tailored tax reduction bill that we had this past year, a bill that was endorsed by the Chamber of Commerce, National Manufacturers' Association, AFL-CIO, and an overwhelming majority of Republicans and Democrats in the House and Senate, but as usual, Mr. Goldwater stood aside, exercised his traditional negative vote and now that there are no votes on taxes, now that there are no proposals before the Congress relating to these things, he has a sort of never-never wonderland of fiscal policy of promising vast tax reductions, sharing of the rest of the revenue and increasing expenditures and other outlays to fantastic proportions.

Mr. ANDERTON. Piers Anderton, ABC.

During your 2 days in Washington, did you talk to President Johnson about the campaign? If so, could you tell us a little bit about it?

Senator HUMPHREY. I did yesterday morning. In fact, the first thing he said was to tell Ray Howard of the Wichita Falls "hello, and express my greetings to Mrs. Yarborough," and asked me whether or not I was going to have the privilege of Congressman Graham Purcell and Senator Yarborough, all of which I reported in the affirmative. Most of our discussions are in the affirmative. [Laughter.]

He told me I would have a fine welcome in Texas and he was very pleased I had accepted the requests to come here. That was about it. He asked me about our last trip. I told him it was delightful; it was an exciting experience. I thought they were very friendly audiences, large audiences, and very receptive.

VOICE. Senator, did he tell you anything about his estimate of the situation in Texas, Senator?

Senator HUMPHREY. No. As a matter of fact, we did not discuss the Texas matter, that is, between the President and myself. However, I have discussed it with Senator Yarborough; I have discussed it with Congressman Purcell.

I did read the press; I did read the amazing and a very heartening result of the Texas primary.

Mr. MORGAN. Morgan, ABC.

In that, Texas, do you have any trepidation coming into Texas, looking for votes with your image, a liberal supporting a liberal?

Senator HUMPHREY. Not at all. I find that Texans are very—about as friendly people as you can find in the United States. They occupy a big State; they have a big heart; and they have broad understanding, great tolerance, and good understanding; they send a man like Ralph Yarborough to the Senate; send a man like Graham Purcell to the Congress. This is the State of Sam Rayburn; this is the State of Lyndon Johnson. I don't think I will have any trouble in Texas.

The main trouble we will have here is just making sure that this State goes overwhelmingly for President Johnson.

Mr. KENWORTHY. Senator?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, Mr. Kenworthy.

Mr. KENWORTHY. The parity ratio is lower, I believe, than at any time since 1938. What do you think Congress should do about this?

Senator HUMPHREY. Speaking of the farm program, I would say that while the parity ratio showed are somewhat lower, the volume of gross income of agriculture, and net income of agriculture, are higher. The net income is \$1 billion more than it was per year, than it was in 1960. 1960 was the last period of a full Republican administration.

What's more, in Texas the farm income is up substantially. The drop in parity ratio that was attained some months was due to the drop in cattle prices in part. Those prices have now been substantially restored and as you know, the Congress in cooperation with the President has strengthened the President's hands in dealing with unusual amounts of meat imports.

There is a substantial purchasing program of beef products so that today, our cattlemen are in much better shape. I think the best answer to it is that farmers all throughout the United States, in every public opinion survey, are stronger for President Johnson when they take a look at the Goldwater record.

X

34 HHF

What they see is no relief, no help, no votes, no cooperation.

Mr. DUNCAN. Senator, Dawson Duncan, Dallas News.

In the local paper this morning, the Republicans carry a half page ad asking two questions: Why did you vote in the U.S. Senate against the oil depletion allowance, and (2) why did you vote in the U.S. Senate against ownership by the State of Texas against the offshore tidelands?

VOICE. What was that?

Mr. DUNCAN. Why did you vote in the U.S. Senate against ownership by the State of Texas against its 'offshore' tidelands? Do you have any communications to supply of either one of those?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, sir, I certainly do. First of all, may I say that the sponsor of the oil depletion allowance that I voted for was the Republican Senator from Delaware, Mr. Williams. I sometimes have had my doubt because of the sponsorship of these amendments. It ill----- the Republicans to be presented as against depletion allowance when their votes in the Senate are all too often a solid bloc against them. In reference to my vote, I have voted to reduce the depletion allowance from 27 1/2 to 22 1/2 percent on a graduated scale. I voted to maintain full depletion allowance for what you or we might call a small producer with an income of a billion dollars or more.

It is my view, sir, that just as President Kennedy expressed it, that all of our resources need to have a new look in terms of resources policy. For example, in my State, we have a depletion allowance of only 13 percent for iron ore. Now, should that be 27 1/2 percent or should that be 15 or 20?

I hope you will recognize that I was a Senator, and I am a Senator, from the State of Minnesota. I try to represent my State very honestly and very fairly, just as the Senator from Texas, Senator Yarborough, represents his State, with the same vigor.

This administration under President Johnson, which will give the American oilman the fairest deal that he ever had, and Senator Humphrey, the vice-presidential nominee, with President Johnson, will support the President's program. And if the oilmen of Texas and Oklahoma, and America, can't trust Senator Johnson or President Johnson, then they ----- a friend and can't trust anyone.

I would believe it might be well if everyone took a good look at the President's attitude, the President's program and the whole resources policy of our country. What I did in my vote, I stand by. It's a matter of public record.

Mr. SCHERER. Senator, Scherer, NBC.

Mr. Miller appears to have charged that you at one time advocated giving our atomic bomb into the custody of the U.N. Did you do that? If so, why?

Senator HUMPHREY. I am not sure whether Mr. Miller is an actor or a politician. If he is an actor, then he is entitled to all of this play upon the truth, play upon words, even play upon the public. But if he is a politician seeking seriously a high office such as the Vice President, then he ought to relate his statements to the truth.

Senator Humphrey at one time, like President Truman and every other leader in our Government, supported the Baruch plan for international control of atomic weapons, and the Baruch plan was before the United Nations for several years. That plan obviously could not or did not receive the support of the Soviet Union and other countries in the Soviet bloc, and because of that, we abandoned it and have maintained our own nuclear arsenal as a matter of national defense.

And Mr. Miller is apparently attempting to take something out of context. He refers to an article of 1950. Senator Humphrey at no time felt that this country ever should give up its control over nuclear weapons, unless all nations everywhere were going to abandon nuclear weapons, which was the Baruch plan, and the Baruch plan was the sponsored plan of this Government, supported by the later Arthur Vandenburg, supported by both Republicans and Democrats alike in the U.N.

Senator Humphrey has never believed in unilateral disarmament. In fact, I believe my record in this field is one that is acceptable, respectable, honorable, and effective.

(delete:
replace with:
"Senator
HUMPHREY")

(insert:
"indistinct")

(insert:
"indistinct")

sh
ve
r
ed



35 HMF

VOICE. Senator, to get back to the depletion allowance, is it your position it should be reduced from 27½ to 22½ percent?

Senator HUMPHREY. My position is the Democratic platform and my position is the position of this administration, and this administration, in the last tax bill, presented no program on depletion tax allowance.

It did under President Kennedy ask a change informally which would have reduced some or had the effect of the depletion allowance but it is my statement as a vice-presidential candidate that I will continue and do support the position of the President of the United States on all depletion allowances for gas, for oil, for clay, for iron ore, and other mineral products. It has been my voting position as a Senator from Minnesota that the depletion allowance should have been reduced. That is a matter of record and I do not deny my record.

But I want to make it clear I am not running for the Senate.

VOICE. Senator, I have a farm question. From 1960 through 1963, do you realize net income for farms before Government had added an increase of about 9 percent. During the same period, Government payments increased about 269 percent from \$175 in 1960 to \$472 in 1963. With Government payments increasing at this rate, is Government's control of farmers increasing or decreasing?

Senator HUMPHREY. The programs we have today on those payments, sir, are basically the wheat program and feed-grains program, and the largest increase which you have referred to, sir, is in the feed grains.

It is a voluntary program; it is not mandatory, nor is the wheat program mandatory. It is a voluntary program and the purposes of the increased payment an incentive to the farmer to take out of production unneeded productive facilities land, put that land into conservation practices, cost compliance so that the farmer who produces and complies with the program will receive a fair income for that which he produced on his farm.

So it is a fact that as of date, our payment of farm income have gone up about 9 percent, that payments have added substantially to farm income.

I intend to address to some degree to this matter Saturday at the national plowing contest in Fargo. I will only say this. Agriculture is so important to America, that cost of agriculture programs must not be charged up to farmers, any more than the cost of national security ought to be charged up to Reserve generals.

It ought to be charged to the Nation. We need our agriculture. It is our greatest success. We need it at home and we need it abroad and the fact of the matter is that the cost of this program has diminished under the Kennedy-Johnson program.

The surpluses have been reduced, cost of storage has been reduced. The cost of the carry of the program and Commodity Credit has been reduced. I think it's quite a commendable record.

Mr. ZIMM. Marvin Zimm, Time magazine.

I'd like to ask two questions about civil rights. First of all, I wonder if you could appraise the degree of compliance to the civil rights, whether there's been adequate compliance so far, and secondly, whether you believe there needs to be any strengthening of the civil rights law in the next administration.

Senator HUMPHREY. I believe I speak for most people when I say that fair-minded and reasonable people are pleased with the degree of compliance to the civil rights law. Actually, the amount of compliance has been surprisingly good. It's been so in Texas; it's been so all through the South, and it's been so in many areas of the North. It's not a palliative. It does not cure everything, by a long shot.

You ask me whether or not I think it ought to be strengthened. I do not. I think we ought to become adjusted to this law and give it an opportunity to be applied, give an opportunity for localities and voluntary groups and State agencies to work on this program at a local and State level to seek compliance with the law, observance of the law, and then also to be able to have the Federal Government take whatever positions are necessary or whatever actions are necessary under the law to fulfill the requirements of the act.

36 HHH

Anyone else?

VOICE. The ADA, I believe, is in favor of turning the Panama Canal over to the U.N.

Senator HUMPHREY. It is not.

VOICE. That's the impression I have.

Senator HUMPHREY. That's the wrong impression. The ADA has not recommended that and needless to say, I am unalterably opposed to it. There are some Republicans that are for it but I am opposed to it.

I am glad you asked this question because there seems to be a few people that have a misguided notion about this matter.

Any others? Thank you.

Wichita Falls, Tex.
September 17, 1964

PREPARED TEXT FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

It's good to be back in the great State of Texas. Less than 3 weeks ago I spent a delightful weekend in your State at a rather well-known ranch operated by a rather prominent Texan.

He told me I should do some extensive campaigning in his native State and here I am.

I flew here from Washington with your able and gifted Senator Ralph Yarborough, and your outstanding Congressman Graham Purcell. As we flew here, I told them how much this country reminded me of my native State of South Dakota.

I feel at home here on the plains. I feel at home in an area where the main farm products are cattle and wheat. I feel at home in an area where most of the voters are Democrats.

I want to say the same words to you good Oklahomans who crossed the Red River today to attend this Democratic rally.

Whether we're from Texas or Oklahoma or Minnesota or South Dakota, we all have one thing in common: We're all good Democrats.

And we're all going to make sure that Lyndon B. Johnson is given an overwhelming victory on November 3.

When it was announced that I was coming down here, there were a lot of expressions of interest among the press. They wondered how well I would be received.

I'm a little amused, and perhaps even a little annoyed, by this interest because it shows that far too many people in this country still think in the narrow terms of their own section or their own region.

They forget that each and every one of us is an American, that this is *one* country, that we are *one* people, that we all share *common* problems and all aspire to *common* goals.

The farmer in South Dakota has the same problems that the farmer here in north Texas faces. He's being caught in the cost-price squeeze—between the cost of doing business and the prices he's paid for his products.

Your Congressman Graham Purcell knows this as well as anybody in the country. He is a member of the new special commission that has been named to study the price spread between the price the farmer gets for his product and the price the consumer pays in the store.

I am sure this study will bring forth recommendations that will give the farmers of north Texas and southern Oklahoma and central Minnesota and all America a better break.

This is the pledge of your Senator Ralph Yarborough. This is the pledge of your Congressman Graham Purcell. This is the pledge of Hubert Humphrey and this is the pledge of President Lyndon B. Johnson.

The Democratic Party has always been the friend of the farmer and it always will be as long as we have men like Ralph Yarborough, Graham Purcell, and Lyndon B. Johnson.

The Democratic Party moved to help the wheat farmer by passing the wheat-cotton bill this year.

I was deeply involved in winning passage of this bill and I can tell you that we could not have done it without the help and leadership of your Congressman Graham Purcell, who is the chairman of the Wheat Subcommittee in the House, and the effective work of Ralph Yarborough in the Senate.

37 HHF

But I don't suppose it's any secret to you folks how the Republican pretender to the Presidency of the United States voted on this bill.

As usual he voted no.

He voted against the wheat farmers of America—he voted against the economy of north Texas.

But I must say this was a consistent vote. He's always voted no. He's always voted against. He's allergic to progress.

You know, I'm a little intrigued by Barry Goldwater's consistent indifference to the American farmer. After all, he was a merchant, the son and the grandson of a merchant, and he should know better.

I, too, am the son of a merchant and I can tell you that unless the farmers are prospering, the store owner's cash register isn't ringing.

I should think Barry Goldwater would have learned this a long time ago. But then he looks at things differently than most Americans. He looks through glasses without any lenses.

My intention during this campaign is to contrast the record of Barry Goldwater—one that is against, against, against—with that of Lyndon B. Johnson—a leader who has consistently preached the doctrine of responsibility and who has worked tirelessly to promote progressive programs to help all Americans.

This is just one of the messages we plan to bring to the American people. We also want to remind every mother, every father, every voter that the power of life or death for this country lies in the hands of the President of the United States. The people here in Wichita Falls have special reason to realize this because there is a Strategic Air Command unit stationed at nearby Sheppard Air Force Base. And I don't have to remind you that each B-52 bomber carries more explosive power than was used in all of World War II.

The responsibility for using nuclear power, my fellow countrymen, must rest in the hands of only one man—the President of the United States—not with some field commander as some political candidates have urged.

The American people are fortunate that we have in the White House a reliable, responsible leader from Texas who understands the use of power and who realizes that restraint and patience are virtues; and that the extremism of impetuosity and bellicosity are sins.

The late Sam Rayburn—the greatest leader who ever served in the House of Representatives—always gave a brief bit of advice to every new Member.

"Just a minute," Mr. Rayburn used to caution.

This was his way of saying that every problem requires analysis and careful study—that every answer should be carefully weighed and that every utterance of a public official should be responsible.

Lyndon Johnson learned his lessons well from the beloved Speaker. For this the American people are fortunate. And they will express their gratitude this fall by giving Lyndon B. Johnson and the American people an overwhelming victory.

Wichita County, Tex.
Courthouse
September 17, 1964

TRANSCRIPT OF REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY, DEMOCRATIC VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE

Senator YARBOROUGH. Senator Hubert Humphrey. [Wild applause.]

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, Ralph. Thank you very much.

Senator YARBOROUGH; Dr. Wright, thank you for your invocation.

Congressman Purcell, Opal, Muriel, and our fine county chairman here, Professor Edwards, and my fellow Americans from this great northern part of Texas, my fellow Democrats, its wonderful to be with you. [Applause.]

38 HHF

I have been sitting here on this platform looking at this beautiful, magnificent city of Wichita Falls. I want to commend the city fathers. I surely want to commend the citizenry. I want to compliment the State of Texas for such a fine, progressive, growing, modern city. It is a wonderful place. [Applause.]

Ralph, I want you to notice "way across over there on the second floor of that building, a fine, modern building. There is a sign saying, "Welcome, Hubert and Ralph." I think we are going to add a line also saying, "Welcome, Graham," because also Congressman Purcell is with us.

I have been privileged to bring a special message to you, a message from a fellow Texan, a gentleman who occupies the high office of President, because yesterday morning before he left on his tour to the West, he called at our home and Muriel and I both spoke to the President and Lady Bird and I was asked to bring two greetings: first, a greeting to all the good people of Wichita Falls and this area, and he told me about these Oklahomans, too, and asked me to remember him to them, and secondly, he said, "I want you to tell that good friend of mine that runs that Wichita Falls paper, Rhea Howard, "hello," too, and tell him to keep printing the right kind of news.

Now, Rhea, I want you to be sure to report back to the President that I have fulfilled his first order on my visit to Texas.

I was told by a Goldwaterite that the minute I got off the plane here at the airport that somebody would come up to rescue me and I'll be darned, I think it was almost right. There was a fellow, Cherriff Boyles, right out there putting the arm on me. I can tell you, I have never been taken into custody by a better law man, never a better. He had a Cadillac and he votes Democratic. [Applause.]

Now, Senator Yarborough said that Senator Humphrey is a very forthright man because he praised Mrs. Humphrey and told you of what is always the truth—all we husbands know this, that whenever there is any way or any success in your life or when it appears there may be some, you can always give a large measure of the credit to your wife.

I want to set the record straight. I said "Behind every successful man stands a surprised mother-in-law." [Laughter.]

And also a good wife. We are certainly blessed, those of us in public office, by that happy set of circumstances known as a good marriage and a good wife.

Today I come to talk to you after being in your State just a few weeks ago. As I recall, I was here just less than 3 weeks ago and I spent a rather delightful weekend at a rather well-known ranch operated by a rather well-known Texan. I enjoyed it immensely.

While there, he told me I would have to do and, being a loyal, faithful, running-mate to the man that is going to be the next President of the United States, I am here. He is the boss.

I stood here with one of the finest men who ever served in the U.S. Senate, and one who has the people of this State at heart in every vote and every action. I am here to say the people of Texas would do themselves proud, and a great honor, by reelecting by a thumping majority, Ralph Yarborough to the U.S. Senate.

And, I might add, they will sure do themselves well by supporting that grand Governor that they have round here, too, Governor Connally.

Here we have with us on this platform a gentleman that encourages me to come to his District, brave man he is. And I hope before I leave, you can say he is a wise man, but he is one of the finest representatives for any District in any part of America, a clean-cut gentleman, a man that constantly thinks of the well-being of his District, his State, and his Nation.

And I am very proud that I was accompanied by, on this trip, by your own Congressman Graham Purcell. [Applause.]

Graham, they tell me you are going to be reelected. I have already had the word and I am sure that this is going to be the case.

Now, this State, this area, I say, reminds me of the area I visited last week and where I was born, my native State of South Dakota. We always told a story in South Dakota. You can stand at the depot and see 15 miles straight down the track in the flatlands of the Dakota lands.

39 HHF

Ralph Yarborough stole my best line. I was going to say the only difference was you had the Comanches; we had the Sioux. He said it.

I want to repeat it. That is the only difference, except I think you have a greater number of people, but there are a number of people, Dakotans, here. I have already found that out, that South Dakota is famous for our exports.

I found also the State of Minnesota, which I am so proud to represent in the Senate, has sent a large advance guard to Wichita Falls and I feel at home. I feel at home where the main industry is agriculture, and yet where that agriculture blends in with the urban life and life of small towns, where the farmers are ranchers and cattle men and wheat men, and where they produce grain, sorghum, and where they understand soil conservation, where they appreciate the importance of modern agriculture that is energized and served by modern electric facilities, I fell right at home. This is the kind of country in which I was born and reared. [Applause.]

In fact, as we came down the street, I saw a drug store. Well, I was born above one, and raised inside one. I can honestly say I do know a little bit about the problems of a small business man. I didn't inherit a department store but I worked in a drug store. [Applause.]

As I said, I wanted to note very openly that there is a sign out there that says, "Oklahoma Wheat Growers." They know who their friend is, Lyndon Johnson. They know. [Applause.]

By the way, will you good folks from Oklahoma take back greetings and hard work for Carl Albert and for Senator Mike Monroney, and the State of Oklahoma, and that new Senator they are going to send up there, Fred Harris. They need him.

We have got a lot of things in common, we folks from Oklahoma and South Dakota, from Texas. The first thing we have got in common is we are all Democrats. [Applause.]

As a Senator used to say, "I am a Democrat without prefix, suffix, or any apology."

I know what the purpose of this gathering here today is, and I am happy to see the bands here today. You want to be sure to keep in practice because on November 3, you are going to play the greatest victory march you have ever played in your life because on that day, Lyndon B. Johnson is going to be reelected President. [Applause.]

You people keep your band in good shape; keep that smile on your faces; look like a Democrat; vote like a Democrat, so you can live like a Republican. It's a good idea.

Now, when I announced I was going to come down here, why, there were a lot of expressions of _____ among the members of the press corps, and others. They wondered why a northern Senator would be coming down this way.

Well, I go back again to the great statesman of this State in contemporary times, the one and only Sam Rayburn, whose homespun philosophy was the kind of commonsense that all of us can well respect.

He said he wanted to—in his first speech, you may recall—he wanted to live in a country that knew no North, no South, no East, no West. I think that one of the worst things that can happen to America is to have some form of discrimination or segregation on the basis of regions. We are Americans. Sure, we are Texans. Sure, we are Minnesotans, surely, we are Oklahomans, but what we are interested in is the United States of America and its welfare. [Applause.]

This is one country. That is what it means when we say "these United States of America," and this is one people, "We, the people," says the Constitution of the United States of America. And we talk in that Constitution of a "common defense" and of the "general welfare," and we are one country, one people, with common problems and common goals.

I traveled the length and breadth of this land, my friends, and our problems are very much the same. Families have the same worries; businessmen have the same competitive spirit; workers have the same trade or skill; farmers have the same concerns over weather, disease, prices, and marketing. This is not a country of conflict. It has its differences, but above all, what it has is a great national unity.

(insert:
"indistinct")

40 HHF

The farmer of South Dakota has the same problems as the farmer of northern Texas. He is being caught in the cost-price squeeze, between the cost of doing business and the prices he is paid for his products.

You Congressmen here on this platform today, my friends, know this as well as anybody in the country. He is a member of the new special commission that has been named to study the price spread between what the farmer gets for his products and the price the consumer pays in the store and the Congressman, I am sure that this study will bring forth recommendations that will give the farm producers of northern Texas and Oklahoma and central Minnesota, and all of America, a better break.

In fact, there are better days here. They are better now than they were and there are better days to come. I could not help but not in our press conference today questions about agriculture.

Well, cattle prices are up. We passed legislation to strengthen the hands of the President. We have expanded our beef exports and the Democratic Party platform pledge is parity of income for our farmers and one thing about the Democratic administration and Democrats with a Democratic Party platform, we like farmers. We include them in the American community. We don't forget them, as has been the record of every Republican administration in this country. [Applause.]

The pledge I made to you is the pledge of Ralph Yarborough, the friend of agriculture, and friend of Main Street, the friend of labor.

All those voices of America that seek to divide us, I have listened to those candidates that go up and down the land trying to divide the South from the North, trying to divide labor from farmer, trying to divide the city from the world, trying to divide you from the Federal Government and local government.

Those are the voices of disaster and doom; those are the voices that should be repudiated by every red-blooded American. We need America unified. [Applause.]

In case you have someone who has to voice his, just listen. The voice that comes to the South and says one thing, and then has somebody go to the North and say the other, there aren't two messages for America. There is only one for America. That is the message of building every section of this country, helping our people enjoy equal opportunity, seeing to it that America grows in every single State and region, that every person regardless of race, age, or religion has an opportunity to enjoy America for America.

What we are trying to do is open up the pathways of opportunity. We want every American in this land to give his best; that is the pledge and promise of your President. We are not asking that some people take a back seat. We are asking that everybody do their best. We are asking that everybody do everything that they can do to make a contribution to the strength and might and wealth and world commitment of this land.

That is our policy. That is our pledge that comes to you. [Applause.]

Now, my friends, understand that up in Des Moines, a spokesman for a Republican Party decided to say something about agriculture. If I may be a bit pointed in my comments, he doesn't know the difference between a ukelele and the corn cob when it comes to agriculture, or if he does, his voting record doesn't show it.

But we in the Midwest and we down here know something about it because we live with it. The Democratic Party can go before any farm audience, before any audience of any kind of people, and say frankly and honestly that it's been the friend of the farmer and it always will.

As long as you elect to the Senate men like Ralph Yarborough, and men to the Congress like Congressman Purcell, and as long as you keep a man in the White House like Lyndon B. Johnson— [Applause.]

We know that America and agriculture hasn't shared equitably and fully in this country and because we know it, we are trying to do it, and you don't do something by saying "No, no, a thousand times no."

delete extra "l"

X

note

X

41 HHF

What this country needs is people that are for something and I have yet to find out what the opposition is for. [Applause.]

I said something about the wheat farmer. The Democratic Party wants to help the wheat farmer and the cotton farmer by passing the wheat and cotton bill this year and that gave hundreds of millions of dollars of income, not only for the farmer, but farm machinery, operators, salesmen, workers, you AFL-CIO, business, deposit in the city bank, ~~The~~ customers in the restaurants, people that could pay their bills. I tell you it could not have been done without your Congressman who was Chairman of the Wheat Subcommittee of the House of Representatives, and could not have been done without the help of Ralph Yarborough in the Senate. [Applause.]

But I don't suppose it's any secret to you good folks, intelligent as you are, how that Republican pretender to the Presidency of the United States voted on the bill, as usual. He voted no.

Yesterday, Mr. Farmer, when you were in distress, he said no to you. And he has a habit of it. He voted against the wheat farmers of America, and that is a vote against every businessman on Main Street and every farmer in this area and against the economic well-being of this country.

I must say it is a consistent vote. He voted no on REA. He voted no every time on 35 rollcalls on REA and that was something when it was over.

What else has he done? He voted no on all the cotton legislation. Voice. Get him out of there.

Senator HUMPHREY. Anybody for that? You've got the right, I hear.

Now, he has voted his conscience because tells him to vote no, but I am a little intrigued by Mr. Goldwater's consistent indifference to the American farmer. After all, he was the son of a merchant, a merchant, and the grandson of a merchant. He should know better.

I, too, am a son of a merchant. I can tell you I know people. I can tell you unless the farmers are prospering, Humphrey's Drug Store goes broke. [Applause.]

I'll bet the same thing will happen to Barry's Department Store, too.

I should think that Senator Goldwater should have learned this but he looks at things differently than most Americans. This is a man whose clock has no hands and whose glasses have no lenses, and when you are looking through glasses with no lenses, you come up with a "no."

in My intention ^{is} this campaign, and I am glad to start it here in this rugged State of Texas, where we can talk straight from the shoulder, is to contrast the record of the Republican pretender to the presidency, a record that is against, against, against, no, no, no, with that of the record of Lyndon B. Johnson, a leader who has consistently preached the doctrine of responsibility, who has worked tirelessly to promote progressive programs to help all American. [Applause.]

My friends, this is just one of the many messages we hope to bring to you and the American people in general. We are going to remind in this campaign every mother, every father, yes, every citizen, every voter, that the power of life and death of this country lies in the hands of the President of the United States.

People here in Wichita Falls have special reason to realize this fact because here within a few miles of where I speak is a Strategic Air Command unit of our powerful Air Force, stationed at nearby Shepard Air Force Base. And I don't have to tell anyone in this audience, each B-52 bomber carries more explosive power than was used all the time in every day, month, and year in World War II. That is the kind of power we are talking about, and the responsibility for using that nuclear power must rest in the hands of only one man, the elected civilian President of the United States, and not with some field commander, as some political candidates have urged. [Applause.]

Yes, my good friends, the American people are fortunate indeed that we have today in the White House a reliable, a responsible, a strong leader of this great State of Texas, who understands the use of power, but who realizes because of moral commitment that restraint and patience are virtues and that the extremism of impetuosity and bellicosity are sins.

bank, the

X

X

Americans

X

42 HHH

The late Sam Rayburn, the greatest leader who ever served in the House gave us a bright bit of advice to every member and he did it to me. It took me a little while to catch on but I did.

"Just a minute," Mr. Rayburn used to caution. "Wait just a minute." Those three words, "Just a minute," this was his way of saying that every problem requires analysis, were complex and terrible and that every answer should be carefully weighed and that every utterance of a responsible public official should be a responsible utterance.

Lyndon B. Johnson, friend of Sam Rayburn, Lyndon B. Johnson, U.S. Senator and now President of the United States, learned his lessons well from the beloved Speaker who was a great teacher for this.

The American people can be very grateful. They owe a debt to that philosopher of the countryside, Mr. Rayburn, and I am sure that the American people will express their gratitude this fall to the late and beloved Sam Rayburn, and express this confidence this fall in the President of the United States by giving to your man from Texas, this big man from the big country, that has such an opportunity for greatness, that you are going to give this man an overwhelming vote of confidence, and that you are going to give Lyndon B. Johnson a chance to serve America and the Free World 4 more years in Washington. [Applause.]

Goodbye folks, come to see us in Washington.

Waco, Tex.

Mall

September 17, 1964

TRANSCRIPT OF ADDRESS BY SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you, thank you, thank you very much.

Thank you very much. Senator Ralph Yarborough, I gather from the response I heard here today when you were introduced, and when you said those extravagant and kind words about me, folks around Waco way feel that Ralph Yarborough is a good Senator. So do I. [Applause.]

First, I want to pay my respects to the county leaders, the county chairman, George Nokes, for this wonderful reception. I know how hard it is to bring together a group like this at this early stage in the campaign. I was told when I left for this trip in Texas that I could expect almost anything and let me tell you that I have had everything, the most wonderful receptions accorded to Mrs. Humphrey and myself and the hospitality of this great Lone Star State, and this fine community of Waco simply could not be surpassed. We want to thank you very, very much. [Applause.]

You know, before I forget it, I want to pay my respects to a fellow teacher. I was once a professor of political science myself and because politics is a rather precarious business, I kind of like predictions in case anything goes wrong.

I would like to say to Professor Armstrong apparently she is a good teacher, because she got a lot of speaking out of Democrats. The State

The only thing, I am choosing up sides for L.B.J. and H.H.H.

I am going to make a pledge here, a statement here, that I don't think any other candidate is going to be able to fulfill. I said yesterday when I was preparing for this trip to come to Texas that I wanted to do something good for Texas, so I talked to the President.

I said, "Mr. President, before I go to Texas, is there anything we might do that will be helpful to Texas?" He said, "Yes, sir, Hubert, pray for rain." [Applause.]

And I will tell you we prayed loud and it rained hard. [Laughter.]

Now, folks, after all that has been done, we don't claim credit for the rain, even if we do get occasionally blamed for the drought. After all that has been done, the least you can do to show appreciation for the President is to elect for 4 years to the White House the man from Texas, Lyndon Johnson, and he can take Hubert Humphrey with him. [Applause.]

One of the advantages of being on the campaign trail, you have so many smart people working for you. I have a page saying "Historical Information." I didn't know how interesting it was until I looked

carefully

X

? is there a line missing? X

43 HHF

at it. It says tradition says that in undated time, the Great Spirit led the Wacos, from whom the name of this city was derived, to the fertile valley of the Brazos, promising as long as they drank from the gushing springs, their people would flourish.

Now, my friends, there is a lesson to be drawn from this. May I say that as long as you support the Democratic Party and keep the Democratic administration in power, Texas will prosper and so will the Nation. [Loud applause.]

By the way, your fine Congressman, Bob Poage, called me, and wanted to be present. Give Bob Poage a good hand. [Applause.]

As you know, he had to be in Washington. He is a very key man on one of the committees, Agriculture Committee, and he is today the chairman of a group that is trying to extend the Food for Peace program, which is so important to our international efforts. We are deeply indebted to this statesman for agriculture.

But I must say that he surely has carried on a great tradition, if I am not mistaken, stemming from that eminent statesman and leader, that statesman from Texas, Tom Connally, who represents this area, and then comes Bob Pope.

When I look at Waco, it seems like you have been doing all right—12th Air Force Tactical Unit, James Connally Air Force Base, Veterans' Administration Hospital for Northern Texas, one of the finest veterans' hospitals in all Texas, a Hunter Aerospace center. Seems to me Bob Poage and Ralph Yarborough have been doing all right up in Washington. [Applause.]

Now, I want to ask the press not to report this because I haven't been able to do this good at all. Of course, I could say that they got a little more influence in the White House than I have up there.

Ladies and gentlemen, I know that this county, this area, this district, has a remarkable record of economic progress and social progress. And I also know that your district has one of the finest political records of any district in the United States.

I believe that I am correct when I say it is another historical fact that this Congressional District, this 11th District of Texas has never gone Republican. You have always had good sense and voted Democratic. [Wild applause.]

You know, there are only two States in the United States that can claim that record, one is the State of Georgia and I have with me today one of the State electors from Georgia, an old friend of mine, Mac Barber, who served 14 years in the State legislature in Georgia, and Georgia always voted Democratic and Arkansas voted Democratic, and the 11th Congressional District of Texas voted Democratic, and Minnesota is learning how. I think that is a great record.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, for just a few moments, I want to talk to you about what I consider to be the program of promises that has been kept by this administration and I am talking now to you about the Kennedy-Johnson administration.

I know that this district gave John Fitzgerald Kennedy the largest vote of any congressional district in the State of Texas in 1960, and that is—. [Applause.]

And I have the feeling, with the folks back here and the folks out there, and ought to be around here, that in 1964, you are going to give an even larger vote to a son of Texas, Lyndon B. Johnson.

I know that you are going to do it.

The man says I am supposed to hurry it up. I have no intention doing it at all. I am enjoying this and it will show on the record that we are having fun here.

I want to say a word or two about your Congressman Bob Poage. I know he loves his district, his State and his Nation and he has an admirable record. He's done so much for your agriculture which is so vital to this area that it seems to me everyone here owes him a debt of gratitude.

I know it is not only agriculture that makes up your economy but this is a part of it, and I want to say that Bob Poage's work in the House of Representatives has been nothing short of monumental but every time that Bob Poage and Ralph Yarborough get together to do something for the agriculture, for wheat farmers, cotton, soy bean

44 HHF

farmers, try to do something for those out there tilling the soil and there are 300,000 of those people in Texas—every time they get a bill in congress to provide equal opportunity for agriculture, that fellow from Arizona—

CHORUS. Yay.

Senator HUMPHREY. That's right, that gentleman from Arizona, that fellow that is the Republican pretender—[Laughter.] says "No." His record on the feed grains program, on the cotton program, his record on every single commodity program—save one—is a record of "No, no, no, a hundred times no." "Against, against, against."

I am beginning to find out in this campaign what these fellows are *against*. It will be a great day when we find out what they are for. [Applause.]

There is one thing I do want to say, however, that Mr. Goldwater says he is. He's got a conservative—or the conscience of a conservative.

I will say for Mr. Goldwater, he generally keeps his word and he has said this—and I quote him—he says, "I know nothing about agriculture." [Laughter.]

Now, I know that confession is good for the soul but when you are voting that way, it's hard on the pocketbook of the rest of the country.

He went, not long ago, to the milk chocolate company at Hershey, Pa. Both parties met—both Republican parties. [Laughter.]

And the Eisenhower party and the Goldwater party met and Goldwater took a few bows, with his right hand up and kept his left hand behind him, made a few bows and one was to agriculture.

He said he was going to do a lot of good things for agriculture. He's been out making a few speeches. I would remind you of those ancient and true words, "Ye shall be judged by your deeds and not your words." And the deeds of this man in agriculture is a record of negation, a record of complete repudiation of the Republican platforms ever since he has been in public office.

And I say that a Senator that was the chairman of the Senatorial Campaign Committee in 1960, asking Senators to run on the Republican platform that promised to send relief out to the farmers, and voted against that same platform after it had made those promises, cannot be trusted to keep these promises arrived at in Hershey, Pa., arrived at under Eisenhower and Benson in 1964. [Applause.]

Ladies and gentlemen, I think you know the record. Most Senators, Republicans and Democrats alike, were interested enough in the education of American youth and the problems of education so they thought we ought to do something in aid to higher education. Most Senators, Republicans and Democrats alike voted for aid to higher education, that which helps the University of Texas, Baylor University, which will help every university, and most Senators did but—

CHORUS OF VOICES. Not Senator Goldwater. [Applause.]

Senator HUMPHREY. Most Senators were worried about the shortage of our medical facilities; most Senators thought we needed more doctors, better hospitals, better medical facilities, medical technicians, so most Senators, Republican and Democrats alike, voted for a program to aid medical education, for help for your hospitals, your nurses, your medical technicians, and most Senators did it, but—

CHORUS OF VOICES. Not Senator Goldwater. [Applause.]

Senator HUMPHREY. Now, most Senators, Republicans and Democrats alike, thought that a tax reduction that would release vast amounts of money into the hands of business and consumers, \$11.5 billion of it, would be good for business, would be good for America. Most Senators and most businessmen and most workers and most farmers, most Americans wanted a tax program of tax reduction, and Senators, Republicans and Democrats alike, voted—

CHORUS OF VOICES. But not Senator Goldwater. [Applause.]

Senator HUMPHREY. And most Democrats, and most Republicans from Herbert Hoover to Dewey—indeed to Richard Nixon—also said they believed in social security as a general universal program but—

CHORUS OF VOICES. Not Senator Goldwater.

Senator HUMPHREY. All right. This is the record.

HHF 45

Let me just conclude this message with a very serious theme for you all. During my 16 years in Congress, I have tried to learn and I have tried to grow and I have looked for what I call the great teachers.

One of those great teachers was the late and beloved Speaker of the House of Representatives, your own Texan, Sam Rayburn, and, it was Sam Rayburn who admonished every Member of the House and indeed, every new Member of the Senate. He would say, "Young man, you are coming to an important post of public duty. Your responsibilities are heavy and whenever you have a serious problem before you," he would say, "wait just a minute."

In other words, pause, reflect, analyze, think, take a look at it before you make a judgment.

He knew that every decision needed to be weighed carefully and that every utterance of a public official should be responsible, and if there ever was a time when the advice of this wise Texan should be followed, it is now in the world in which we live, because in this world in which we live, there are dangerous forces in the world, and which the power of mankind has created and has at his fingertips to literally destroy the world.

One miscalculation would literally incinerate the globe.

It seems to me you need, at this time, a man who has been a President, a man that has stood and stands as a follower of Sam Rayburn. You need a student and follower of the philosophy of Sam Rayburn, of love of country, and love of humanity, a man who said the Democratic Party was a party with a heart, and a man who said that he wanted an America where there was no South, no North, no East or West, but only America.

So I commend to you today this great, wise, and prudent man. I ask you what would happen if President Lyndon Johnson were to follow impulsive or irresponsible advice, deliver ultimatums, and use massive weapons in southeast Asia. I ask you what would have happened if John F. Kennedy had been irresponsible or unreliable, shooting from the hip and lip in the difficult and dark days of October 1962, in the Cuban crisis?

What would have happened if President Johnson had interfered in a massive way in Cyprus? You know.

Let me tell you why you know. Because not far from this very spot are tactical air units of the 12th Air Force which carry small nuclear weapons, the kind that Senator Goldwater says he would turn over to a commander in the field. Such power, even the use of the threat of such power, should be kept in the hands of a civilian, responsible President.

I will tell you who that man is. The peace of the world today rests not in those who have impulsive responses but in those who have the kind of mature judgment that people can rely upon; the peace of the world today rests in the hands of a President, if you please, who is firm and resolute without being arrogant and belligerent, who seeks understanding and peace without retreat or appeasement, is strong without being bellicose.

A great world power, and that is what we are, must be responsible. Every word, deed, and action must be measured frugally and carefully.

The hope of mankind is in our hands and that is why I say that in the years ahead, the next 4 year, Texas must lead the Nation in assuring that you have in the White House for the next 4 years a trusted, tried, competent man, Lyndon B. Johnson, as our President.

San Antonio, Tex.
John F. Kennedy High School
September 17, 1964

TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY,
DEMOCRATIC VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE

It's wonderful to be in Texas.

It's wonderful to be in the Lone Star State which has grown to greatness by facing challenges, not by running away from them.

46 HHF

It's wonderful to be among people who, with their forebears, have built a mighty, throbbing empire through faith in the future, not through fear and a retreat from reality.

I'm sure that it comes as no surprise for me to tell you that, to the rest of the country, Texas is an almost legendary phenomenon. It is, to be sure, the land of big distances, but far more important, it is a land of big dreams and big deeds.

In Texas, nothing is impossible. As you Texans say: "The possible we do immediately; the impossible will take a little longer."

Texans are incorrigible optimists; you are doers; you are men of unquenchable faith in the future, and you are men and women with an unflagging love of country.

And how different the history of this country would have been but for the leadership in Washington which Texas has furnished during the last 119 years.

Just call the roll of a few of these towering Texans—Sam Houston, John H. Reagan, Thomas Watt Gregory, E. M. House, Morris Shepard, Tom Connally, John Nance Garner, and for almost 50 years, your beloved Sam Rayburn, whose earthy wisdom helped guide eight Presidents and countless Congresses.

Without exception, these were men of faith—men of justice—and men who got things done.

Of this great tradition of faith, justice, and accomplishment, Lyndon Baines Johnson is a shining example. Contrast the leadership of this great American with those frightened and fearful candidates who march up and down the land—waging their war on progress, shrinking from tomorrow's hard jobs, trying to undermine the faith and courage of Americans in their government and in themselves, while shaking their heads and wailing, "No, No, No."

Make this comparison and then you will understand how truly blessed is America to have Lyndon B. Johnson as President of the United States.

Unlike the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party, President Johnson says "Yes" to America.

Four years ago the Kennedy-Johnson administration made 10 basic promises in a program to get America moving again.

Those 10 promises became 10 goals of the Democratic administration.

Those 10 goals became realities—and today America is on the move again.

Four years ago, we promised a minimum wage law of \$1.25. Today working Americans have the guarantee of that minimum wage.

Four years ago, we promised to fight poverty. Today we are engaged in a full-scale war on poverty.

Four years ago we promised to end discrimination. Only July 2 of this year we signed a bill—the greatest guarantee of human rights this country has ever known—into law.

Four years ago we promised to fight disease. Today a Federal program to build new facilities and provide new scholarships for the training of doctors is underway.

Four years ago we promised to fight slums. Today this administration has a five-pronged attack on slums and inadequate housing.

Four years ago we promised this Nation would be first in military strength and first in the pursuit of peace. Today we *are* first in strength, and the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty proves that no one will surpass our determination for a peaceful, safe world for our children.

Four years ago we promised that our economy would grow faster. This administration has led the Nation in 43 months of uninterrupted prosperity. And this year—with the dynamic boost of a major tax cut—will be the most prosperous in American history.

In these four years we have proved to Premier Khrushchev that his Communist economy cannot surpass this free Nation.

Four years ago we promised decent medical care for the aged under social security. The U.S. Senate passed the Nation's first medical care bill for the aged.

Four years ago we promised to make the United States first in space exploration. The successes of the Mercury, Saturn, Ranger, and other programs have launched the United States on its journey to the moon. And the first American to get there will be an astronaut trained in Texas.

47 HHF

Four years ago we promised the farmer a more equitable share in American prosperity. Net farm income has increased by over \$1 billion per year; surpluses have declined; exports have increased.

Those were our 10 promises. Each required the mutual determination of a progressive administration and a sound Congress.

To redeem those 10 promises, we needed the support of the U.S. Senate. And, we got it—except for one man.

Only one Senator out of the hundred said "No" to every one of the promises.

Only one Senator opposed every one of those 10 pieces of legislation.

Only one man voted "No" time after time after time.

Only one man was at the tail end of progress.

That man now asks you to make him President of the United States—that man who said "No" to America time after time—and now America is going to say "No" to him on November 3.

And that man is Senator Goldwater.

Let me make one solemn pledge: *The administration of Lyndon B. Johnson will continue to keep America moving forward in the 1960's.*

And on the basis of his personal philosophy and on the strength of his public record, Barry Goldwater cannot give that pledge to the American people.

The Kennedy-Johnson administration has kept its promises. The Texas farmer, for example, has done well in these Democratic years. Gross income per farm has increased 25 percent. Price support payments have doubled. And I remind you that these are the price supports which the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party wants to abolish.

The continued advancement and prosperity of all Americans—whatever their occupation—will have top priority in President Johnson's drive to build the Great Society.

In his travels across America, the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party claims to have discovered a certain uneasiness among the American people. I'm not surprised. The American people should feel uneasy when a candidate for the Presidency:

Extolls the virtues of extremism in American politics,

But then changes his mind;

Says he will not indulge in personalities in the campaign,

But then changes his mind;

Advocates we negotiate the future of Vietnam with the Chinese Reds,

But then changes his mind;

Proposes we make social security voluntary,

But then changes his mind;

Suggests we sell the TVA,

But then changes his mind;

And opposes and votes against a cut in Federal incomes taxes,

But then changes his mind.

No wonder the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party finds the American people uneasy. His preposterous display of revision, retraction, and repudiation makes everyone uneasy.

The American people know they can't wait until Saturday to learn what the President of the United States meant to say on Wednesday. The American people know we need as President a man who means what he says and says what he means.

And such a man for America is Lyndon B. Johnson. He is the man to keep America moving forward in the 1960's.

48 HHF

John F. Kennedy School
San Antonio, Texas
September 17, 1964

TRANSCRIPT OF ADDRESS OF SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY, DEMOCRATIC VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much.

Well, thank you very much, Henry. My friend, the Congressman from this district, the very great and fine Congressman that gives his heart and his mind and his entire being to the representation of these wonderful people, Henry Gonzalez. We are so proud of you, and you folks are going to reelect him, aren't you? [Applause.]

I bet some of you may have wondered, as I was fiddling around up here with these papers, just what I might have been thinking of. Well, let me tell you what I was thinking. I was thinking how lucky we are to be Democrats. Look at the fun we have. Look at the joy we have. Look at the spirit we have.

Think of it. If you were one of those Republicans, how you would feel right now. [Applause.]

I don't mean a regular Republican. I mean one of those Goldwater Republicans. As Sam Rayburn used to say, it's bad enough to be an "old fogey." It's worse to be a young fogey, you know.

Congressman Gonzalez and Senator Yarborough, and the many fine officers of the city and county government, and school board that are here today, and particularly a word of commendation to Judge Charles Grace, who, you know, is going to be your next county judge—you have got that all set up. [Applause.]

May I extend to each and every one of these officers and these candidates the very best wishes, not only of Senator Humphrey but I know that in these rare and wonderful occasions, as President Johnson's running mate, I am privileged to bring to you the greetings, the good wishes, the help, and the assistance of the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson. [Applause.]

Or, as we would say up Minnesota way, "Viva Gonzalez."

CHORUS OF VOICES. Ray, ray. [Applause.]

Senator HUMPHREY. Viva Yarborough. Viva L.B.J.

CHORUS OF VOICES. L. B. J.

Senator HUMPHREY. Amigos—

VOICE FROM CROWD. Viva Humphrey.

Senator HUMPHREY. It's wonderful to be in San Antonio—and this is Texas. Oh, what a wonderful place. I want to tell you, my friends, Texas—the Lone Star State, Texas—that has given to America a great President; Texas, that has led the way in so many things throughout its whole history from Sam Houston up to Lyndon Johnson; Texas is going to lead the way on November 3, aren't you, to reelect Lyndon B. Johnson? [Applause.]

What a wonderful occasion. I am just singularly honored to be speaking in this new school, the John F. Kennedy School. [Applause.]

And may I—let me tell you that never, never in the history of our country did we ever have a President who so inspired the young, who captured their love and their affection and their hearts as much as our late, beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

I would like in some little way to be able to carry that torch, at least to help carry it, the torch of youth, of education for youth, of opportunity for youth, of the better America for youth—that torch which was passed from the hands of a great and wonderful President, who was taken from us in the zenith, that torch which was passed on to a strong and good man from Texas.

All I want to do is to be able to help the President of the United States carry that torch of enlightenment of youth and opportunity to the young people of America. [Applause.]

By the way, one of the most wonderful developments and one of the most wonderful experiences in all of this campaign is the presence of, and the enthusiastic response of, and the generous help of the young people, young Democrats, young Citizens for Johnson-Humphrey—just young people. [Applause.]

49 HHF

This is the story that needs to be written about American youth. This is the story that needs to be told about our country. We don't need to be lectured all the time about "the tyranny of the Federal Government," which helped, by the way, to build this school, and there wouldn't have been a school here as magnificent as this were it not as Congressman Gonzalez has said, for the help of a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." And that is the kind of government we have and ought not to be criticized or condemned unfairly.

And the gentleman from Arizona, when he tries to divide us from our Government in Washington, does a disservice, and you know it. [Applause.]

Yes, may I say most respectfully and yet very seriously, that it is nothing short of shameful that those who aspire to high public office sometimes seek to divide people on the basis of race and religion. Sometimes they seek to divide us on the basis of geography, North or South, East or West, and all too often, they seek to divide us on the basis of Federal versus State versus county government, and all of it is wrong.

What America needs these days is national unity, national purposes, and first-class citizenship for every American. [Applause.]

It is a fact that the very first bill I authored in the Congress of the United States, which was signed by Harry S. Truman, was a bill to provide Federal aid for school districts where there is substantial Federal employment or what we call the impact of Federal activities.

This school and hundreds more like them have been assisted under that program. Well over \$2 billion have been expended for education in America because of a program that provided aid to education. I am proud of it, aren't you? [Chorus of "Yes."] [Applause.]

And I don't think it has taken our freedom. I am proud of the fact we have a school lunch program, aren't you? [Applause.]

And that we have aid to vocational education, that we have aid for our special milk program. Progress after progress, if you please, on the part of a government that has its responsibility to the people of this country to make America a better America, to make our people a happier people, to have our young people with an opportunity. Isn't that the kind of a government that you want? [Applause.] [Chorus of "Yes."]

May I say that is not the kind of government that you get from one who has as his progress "no, no, no" to every affirmative program, progress, of this Government. That is not the kind of a government that you are going to get from the Senator from Arizona, the Republican pretender to the presidency of the United States, the man that says that he does not want the Federal Government to help our people.

I say to you that the Federal Government belongs to the people, the State government belongs to the people, the school board belongs to the people, and government has a duty to serve the legitimate interests of the people, particularly the young people who deserve the best education that America can provide. [Applause.]

We have some very enthusiastic supporters way back in the end of the hall. I hope the Senator from Arizona can hear them.

And Congressman Gonzalez and Senator Yarborough, I want to particularly thank you men and offer my commendation for the wonderful initiative you have taken for the sponsorship of the HemisFair of 1968. This is just a short way down the road. In fact, the only way you can be sure that fair becomes a reality is to be sure the President in 1968 is also a man who was also for the fair.

Henry, better make sure you get the fair and also Lyndon Johnson. [Applause.]

And if you want to improve the navigation possibilities of the San Antonio River, you had better make sure that it isn't filled up with the sands of Arizona, but rather that it is filled up with the enthusiastic support of a Democratic Party and a Democratic administration.

Well, there is much I wanted to talk to you about and time does not permit. Before I go, one minute further, however.

I want to pay my respects to one of the truly outstanding men of this Nation, a friend of mine, whom I hope that I will have the privilege of seeing in my brief stay at San Antonio, a truly magnificent, kind-hearted spiritual leader that has extended the hand of friend-

50—HHF

ship and of compassion and humanitarianism to hundreds of thousands of people, who is the spiritual leader of this entire area. If I fail to see him, will you please bring to him my warm and heartfelt feeling from an old friend?

I speak of none other than your Archbishop Lucie, right here in San Antonio. [Applause.]

We have worked together on many projects and we intend to be working together, if it is my good fortune that he will permit me to do so, in the years ahead.

Now, my friends, let me just talk to you about a few commitments that were made by the Democratic Party.

Young people all too often are told that those of us in politics make promises but we never keep them. If we do not keep them, then we have every right to be criticized and condemned and removed from office. But if we do keep them, then the record ought to be plain for one and all to see and people then ought to be rewarded by continued support, as your Congressman has kept his commitments.

Now, let's see whether or not the promises that were made in the State of Texas and throughout this Nation in 1960 by John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson, the Democratic ticket of that time, whether or not these commitments and these promises have been fulfilled. I think so, and I have checked the record.

Four years ago, the Kennedy-Johnson administration made 10 basic commitments to the American people. They made a basic commitment to get America moving again, to get it off from dead center, to get America once again to be a vital and young and progressive nation and unafraid, moving into the future instead of constantly fearing the present and looking to the past.

Ten promises became the goals of President Kennedy and Vice President Johnson. Ten promises this day are the commitments and the goals of President Johnson.

Now, those 10 goals became realities and today America is on the move again. Everybody knows it. Our adversaries know it. The American people know it. The people of San Antonio, as a part of the American community, know it. And I even think that Senator Goldwater knows it, if he ever would put the lenses in his glasses to find out what is going on. [Applause.]

Congressman Gonzalez and Senator Yarborough, 4 years ago we presented the then candidate of the Democratic Party, John F. Kennedy, and promised the American people that if a Democratic administration was elected that we would pass a law establishing minimum wages of \$1.25 an hour. Today, working Americans have that guarantee of that minimum wage.

The Congress passed it; the President signed it. Oh, I know that the Senator from Arizona didn't like it but as a matter of fact, there are a lot of things he doesn't like, and you'd be surprised what the American people are going to do about it on November 3.

Four years ago, John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson promised to fight poverty, to fight it wherever we found it, to fight it with whatever resources were at our command and President Lyndon Johnson carried out that promise and declared an open war on poverty. I regret to say the Senator from Arizona did not think that was worth fighting. President Johnson said yes; Senator Goldwater said no. And I expect you are going to say "No" to the "No Man" on November 3, isn't that right?

Four years ago, John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson promised the American people that if elected, we would carry out a program to end discrimination in American life, to proclaim first-class citizenship for every American, regardless of race, color, or creed.

We said we would wage a war on bigotry and we would wage a war on discrimination. We made that pledge on July 2 of this year. The President signed the most comprehensive civil rights bill in the history of this country. [Applause.]

Four years ago, John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson promised to fight disease, promised to wage war on mental illness and mental retardation, promised to step up medical research. Today, we have a Federal program to build new facilities, new medical schools, such as you are trying to build right here in this area under the aid to medical education and medical facilities.

51 HHF

We made that promise and President Kennedy and President Johnson delivered, with a Democratic Congress. Ralph Yarborough voted for it. Henry Gonzalez voted for it. Hubert Humphrey voted for it. But "not Senator Goldwater!"

The Crowd. But not Senator Goldwater.

Senator HUMPHREY. Four years ago, we promised that we would wage war on slums. We promised that we would continue with the housing program and extend it. Low-cost housing, middle-income housing, rural housing, and urban renewal and the greatest national housing act ever passed by the Congress of the United States was passed in the year 1961, renewed in the year 1964, signed by two Presidents.

We kept our word. We voted for it. Most Republicans voted for it. Most Democrats voted for it but—

The Crowd. Not Senator Goldwater.

Senator HUMPHREY. Four years ago, the candidates of the Democratic Party promised this Nation that we would be first in military strength and first in the pursuit of peace, and surely, San Antonio is living proof of the military power of the United States of America. This great city proves it. [Applause.]

Today, we are first in military strength. We have more military might than all the nations of the world combined. Our power is so unbelievable that it is the wonder of the world and this power is not for destruction. That power is not for war. That power is for defense and security, and that power is for peace. Today, we are first in strength and the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty proves that no one will surpass us for our determination is to have a peaceful and safe world for our children.

I say we kept our promises and most Americans, most Republicans, most Democrats voted for the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty in the Senate of the United States, but—

The Crowd. Not Senator Goldwater. [Applause.]

Senator HUMPHREY. And now, my friends, there is a good Democrat in the back— [Laughter.]

Four years ago, the man for whom this school is named promised that he would get this country of ours moving again and that our economy would grow faster. He said that we would expand our employment. He said we would increase our production. He said we would expand the economic pace of America, and this administration has led this Nation in 43 months of uninterrupted prosperity and economic growth.

This year, with the dynamic boost of a major tax cut, which released \$11.5 billion to business and individual citizens, America today has the greatest prosperity that America have ever known or any nation has ever known.

Most Senators, Republicans and Democrats alike, voted for that tax cut, but—

The Crowd. Not Senator Goldwater. [Applause.]

Senator HUMPHREY. Four years ago, John Kennedy, speaking in Texas, promised decent medical care for the aged under social security, and this man did not live to see his dream come true but only a few weeks ago, the U.S. Senate voted by majority vote for hospital and nursing home care for our elderly under the insurance principles of social security.

Yes, most Senators voted for it. We kept our pledge. Most Senators said keep the pledge, but—

The Crowd. Not Senator Goldwater.

Senator HUMPHREY. And now, my friends, let's finish up the commitments we made 4 years ago. We promised to make the United States of America first in space exploration. We were tired of hearing of Sputniks. We wanted Americans to be first. We wanted our astronauts to explore the heavens and outer space and the success of Mercury, Saturn, Ranger, and other programs have launched the United States of America on the journey to the moon, and I predict that the first person to be on the moon will be an American who will be trained in Texas as an American astronaut. [Applause.]

Americans



52 HHF

By the way, if you do get there first, you might even be able to claim it and then you will be bigger than Alaska. [Applause.]

Four years ago, we promised the farmers a more equitable share in American prosperity and farm income in Texas today is up 25 percent. Net farm income has increased by a billion dollars a year over what it was under Republican leadership. Surplus prices have declined. Exports have been increased, and the cost of the farm program has gone down.

We have kept our promise on every farm issue. On every vote, Democrats, a majority of them, and a Democratic President, kept their promises. Most Congressmen, most Senators voted to help the cotton farmers, wheat farmers, rice farmers, voted to help American agriculture, but not—

The Crowd. Senator Goldwater.

Senator HUMPHREY. Now, these are the 10 promises of our Government, 10 promises made, 10 promises kept, and may I say to redeem these 10 promises, we needed the support, the majority support of the U.S. Senate, and we got it, except for one man, only 1 Senator out of 100 said no to every one of these promises. Only 1 Senator out of 100 opposed every one of these 10 pieces of legislation; only one man voted "No" time after time on every promise, on every pledge that was given to the American people. One man was at the tail end of progress while President Johnson wages war on poverty—the temporary spokesman for the Republican Party wages war on progress. [Applause.]

In his travels across America, the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party tells us that he has found an uneasiness among the American people. Well, I'm not at all surprised, because the American people should feel pretty uneasy when a candidate for the presidency on the one hand extolls the virtues of extremism, and after having done that, before all the Nation on television, decides to change his mind; and says that he will not indulge in personalities in the campaign and then calls the President a faker and a phony; advocates that we negotiate the future of Vietnam with the Chinese Reds, but then changes his mind; proposes that we make social security voluntary and then changes his mind; suggests that we sell TVA and then changes his mind about a month ago, and then changed it back again yesterday; opposes and votes against a cut in Federal taxes when the bill is before the Congress and then changes his mind and wants to cut the taxes 25 percent now, and then dish it out of the Treasury to the States just to help him some more.

No wonder. No wonder that the Republican pretender to the Presidency finds the American people uneasy. As one Republican said to me, "GOP used to stand for Grand Old Party. Now it stands for Goldwater's Our Problem." [Applause.]

I suggest to my fellow Americans that America needs a President that can see well, that understands history, that understands the time in which we live, and that understands the course of events now and in the future, and as somebody said, "This Nation of ours cannot afford to have as a President a man who has no lenses in his glasses, who has no months on his calendar, and no hands on his watch."

It seems to me what America needs is someone that understands that these are the times that require responsible leadership. These are the times that require Americans to look ahead. These are the times to bind together our people in national unity and these are the times, if you please, to move America forward, further down the road of the path of opportunity for all, and if that is what you want, and I think it is what you want, I have got the candidate for you. He is the man from Texas. He is your own native son. He deserves your support. He's going to get your support and when he does, he will be elected President of the United States for 4 years, and that's Lyndon Baines Johnson. Thank you. [Applause.]

53 HHF

San Antonio, Tex.
The Alamo
September 17, 1964

TRANSCRIPT OF ADDRESS OF SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY, DEMOCRATIC VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE

Seantor HUMPHREY. Thank you very much. Thank you for a most enthusiastic welcome. You have convinced me. I will accept. [Laughter and applause.]

First of all, I want to join with you tonight in paying well-deserved credit to the gentleman that so ably, so effectively, so honorably, and so energetically represents this great congressional district of Texas, your own Hon. Henry Gonzalez. [Applause.]

And I gather from what I hear at this place and what I hear throughout the District that Gonzalez is going back to Washington next November. [Applause.]

Then, I want to pay a well-deserved tribute to the distinguished senior U.S. Senator from the State of Texas, one who never forgets that he came to Washington to represent the legitimate interests of the people of this great State, a State that has served under six flags, a State that has given to America men of the quality of Sam Houston, Sam Rayburn, and Lyndon B. Johnson, and I refer to your own Senator Ralph Yarborough. [Applause.]

Well, I'd always been told by Henry that San Antonio was a good Democratic city. I want to say this to my fellow Americans and fellow Democrats. We do need a two-party system—the Democrats in power and the Republicans out. [Applause.]

Now, my friends, in this particular year, I want you to be much more considerate than you have been on other occasions because the truth is that ever since the debacle at the Cow Palace in San Francisco, ever since that day when a faction of the GOP kidnapped the organization, there have been literally thousands and thousands of fine Republicans who have put their country above their party and are going to vote the Democratic ticket in November.

So, before we go a bit further, let's get with it.

“Viva Gonzalez—viva Gonzalez. Viva Yarborough—viva Yarborough. [Applause.]

Thank you. My, you're so wonderful.

You know, our program was opened tonight by one of your most esteemed and respected citizens who is a candidate, as you know, for the office of county judge, which is, in fact, I gather, your highest office in this area, and I am sure that because you have demonstrated such good judgment in the past in voting for the Kennedy-Johnson ticket in 1960, and voted for Henry Gonzalez, and Ralph Yarborough, that you are also going to vote for and place in this position of trust and responsibility Judge Charles W. Grace.

By the way, since this is the great American city—and that it is—because I see before me people of all walks of life, every race, creed, and nationality, I am sure that the candidates of Bexar County for the State legislature are going to receive your enthusiastic, dynamic support, and right away—I know I can say it for you—Tom Lee, Jake Johnson, Joe Bernal, John Alaniz, and Bob Vale—and may I add I was just told to put in a word for— [Applause.]

I know these men may have been introduced to you but let me just put it this way. As enthusiastic as we can become for our national ticket—and that is, of course, the most important election in the land—let it never be forgotten that this Government is not all in Washington. It is at the State Capital with your Governor Connally— [Applause.]

And it is in your State legislature with those I have mentioned and many more, in your county commissioner, with Dick Landsman, and other candidates.

I want to say something about these folks over here—somebody got in the parade over here. [Indicating group with Goldwater signs.]

My friends, be good winners. [Laughter and applause.]

There are 38 counties in this great area of southern Texas that are right over here to my left and these are the 38 counties that did so much in 1960 to see to it that that gallant and brave, courageous and intelligent young man, John F. Kennedy, was elected President of the United States. [Applause.]

Now, ladies and gentlemen, just a few words of good—what I hope is down to earth—political discussion that is way down to earth.

54 HHF

We need to talk about our country tonight; we need to talk about what kind of an America we want and what kind we have.

First of all, 1960, Mr. Kennedy in his campaign for the high office of President, said to us that he wanted to get America moving once again and he kept that pledge as faithfully as one would keep his religious vows.

He threw himself into the task when he was elected President, first of all meeting the humanitarian needs of our people. For example, the first Executive order was that food was made available to the needy. Remember that the second Executive order was to see to it that the nutrition, that the diets of those of low incomes was elevated.

I remember that he sent us week after week one message after another calling for the retraining of manpower that was unemployed, calling upon the Congress of the United States to authorize housing programs, to build our cities, clean out our slums, calling upon the Congress of the United States to authorize accelerated public works to give men jobs and to improve the public structure of America.

And then he set forth to do what this city, in a sense, symbolizes, to increase the strength of America.

And San Antonio, yes, Texas, with its many military installations, with its great advances in the aerospace industry—Texas today represents the sharp cutting edge of America might. It represents the mightiest power of America, so that America today can stand before the world as the most powerful nation that mankind has ever known.

We command the respect of friends, and we command the fear of the enemy. [Applause.]

America was in trouble economically; America needed jobs for its unemployed; America needed its factories put to work and this Nation, in less than 4 years, has added over 5 million people to the work force, until today, over 72 million people are gainfully employed in America.

This Nation, in less than 3½ years, has added \$125 billion to its gross national product, so that today, America has a prosperity and a standard of living, the like of which the world has never known.

This was the promise of — [Applause.]

Is it any wonder that today, we have, of course, some problems that face us, but is it any wonder that today, businessmen who traditionally voted for the Republican ticket are—by the hundreds, yea, the thousands—are announcing that they are going to vote Democratic in 1964? [Applause.]

Is it any wonder that today, the great organization of labor, the AFL-CIO, representing the great free trade unions of America—is it any wonder that those great unions today are going to vote for Lyndon B. Johnson as President of the United States? [Applause.]

President Johnson made it crystal clear in his acceptance speech at Atlantic City about our party, this Democratic Party, is an open party, open to people that want to see America move ahead, open to people who want to see America the land of opportunity, open to people who believe in the equality of opportunity, open to people who wish to see America fulfill its promise.

Surely, we have made great gains but we haven't even started. There is a wonderful, whole new era ahead of us.

This party that we represent, while it may, on occasion, falter—this party, believe me, today represents a party of national unity. It seeks not to divide; it seeks to unite, seeks not to push aside.

It seeks not to divide; it seeks to unite. It seeks to build an America; it seeks to build a better America.

Lyndon Johnson was once asked, not long ago, the following question by a television commentator: "Mr. President, Franklin Roosevelt had his New Deal. Harry Truman had his Fair Deal. John Kennedy had his New Frontier. What will you call your administration?"

And quietly, calmly, and surely, the President, President Johnson responded, "This administration seeks only a better deal for all Americans." [Applause.]

We know—we know that this is a task that requires fortitude and perseverance. We know that you do not build a better America in every area of our national life quickly. We know there are no simple answers to difficult problems and there are no childlike answers to man-sized problems. We know that. [Applause.]

55 HHF

But we also know one other thing. We know that what America wills to do, she can do. We know, if know, if America wants to, she can do the impossible.

This is why, if you please, we need a man in the White House that challenges us not to look back, that challenges us not to forget our problems, but rather that challenges us to look ahead and to grasp the opportunities of today.

Throughout my campaign, short as it has been, I have sought from time to time to cite the record because I believe the only way that you can ultimately judge is by how these men in public life have voted, not what they have written only, not what they have said only, but what they have done and how they have voted.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, you heard me—some of you—speak in my acceptance speech in Atlantic City, and I said in that speech that most Americans, Republicans and Democrats alike, had voted for, in the Congress of the United States, a tax program to release into the American economy over \$11 billion of free capital to get America moving again.

Yes, most Americans thought that was good sense. Most Americans thought this was good for America, and most Americans were right, but—

CHORUS OF VOICES. Not Barry Goldwater.

Senator HUMPHREY. Ladies and gentlemen, most Americans, Republicans and Democrats alike, in fact, four-fifths of the Republicans in the Senate, and over four-fifths of the Republicans in the House, and an overwhelming majority of the Democrats in both bodies, yes, Republicans and Democrats alike—most Americans, most Senators, most Congressmen thought and voted that American citizenship should be first-class citizenship, that there should be only one law in the land, a law that applied to all, that we should eliminate from our midst discrimination and bigotry.

We voted for an equal opportunity program. We voted for a civil rights program. [Applause.]

Most Americans, on that day in November, 1964, November 3—most Americans, Democrats, independents and Republicans, are going to vote for Lyndon B. Johnson and not Barry Goldwater.

On this platform tonight are two members of Congress who have, for example, simplified what I call a sense of social justice in public office. These are men committed and dedicated to the system of this Government and the economic system which has made this country great.

We believe in a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people." We believe in a system of private industry in which the initiative and the incentive is there, but we also believe that a government has a responsibility to all of the people, and I have said from every platform and I shall repeat it every opportunity that I get, it's right. It's morally right, and it's politically right for a government of the people, by the people, and for the people to be concerned about the people.

This government of ours, whether it is in Washington or whether it is in Austin or whether it is in San Antonio, its a government of the people, and I do not believe that it does any good, in fact, I think it does grave damage for those who seek high public office to try to spread doubt and fear and suspicion about a government at the national level that has brought America, if you please, some of the blessings that we now enjoy; a government at the State level that is responsible for most of the activity of social service in your State.

I don't think, Mr. Goldwater, that you are performing a public service when you spread doubt and suspicion about the American structure.

And may I add that I do not think that you serve the cause of freedom nor do you serve the cause of peace when you spread doubt and suspicion about the military power of this Nation, Mr. Goldwater? [Applause.]

it's

(period)

56 HHF

And I don't think that you perform a public service when a candidate for the office of President will cast doubt and suspicion, in fact, will make the categorical statement, that the late and beloved John Fitzgerald Kennedy manipulated the Cuban crisis of 1962 for political advantages, which was the charge made by Senator Goldwater. He ought to be ashamed.

There are plenty of things to talk about in this election, and we don't need to talk about a moderate President, who has had the courage to confront the Soviet Union in one of the most dark and one of the most desperate hours of our national existence, and I, for one, resent this kind of campaigning that casts a smear—yes, casts a smog—over one's memory of one of the greatest men that ever served the United States of America. [Applause.]

Ladies and gentlemen, what do we seek to do? We, first of all, seek to have in government men who are responsible. Responsibility is the first quality of leadership. This great Nation of ours has such unbelievable tasks to perform at home and abroad that it must have at the helm of this government someone who is responsible, who understands that his every word and deed affect life, not only of Americans, but of the whole world.

Responsibility has to be the key watchword of Lyndon B. Johnson's entire public life, and responsibility today is the theme of leadership in the White House, and responsibility today is the protection of our freedom and our security. [Applause.]

And then what is the goal of our country? Not just the goal of a party, not just the goal of one man, but what is the true goal of this great Nation?

It is the goal of opportunity, opportunity within freedom, opportunity within a free political society, opportunity within a free economy, opportunity within a social structure that knows no second-class citizenship, opportunity within America, as Sam Rayburn said, that knows no North, no South, no East, and no West. [Applause.]

That opportunity is a hollow mockery unless it is opportunity that is supported by, that is enriched by education—education for every man and woman, every boy and girl that wishes to make something out of his life.

America can afford that and America should provide it. [Applause.]

One other opportunity—the opportunity for the tiller of the soil to receive a fair income from his hard work, and from his abundant production; the opportunity of a worker to belong to a union of his choice, if you please, and the opportunity to be able to advance himself in the life that he lives. [Applause.]

This administration, the administration and the Democratic Party, is pledged first to the stern task of being responsible in the conduct of the affairs of this Nation, responsible at home to the American people, to all the people, not just to some of them, and responsible abroad, knowing, if you please, that the third great goal of this Government is the pursuit of a peaceful and a free and a just world and that, by the way, is not obtained—that is not attained by building bigger bombs and telling field commanders that they can have the right to explode them at their— [Applause.]

The peace that we seek is a peace which will be attained, indeed, through sacrifice and attained through power. We will negotiate only when we negotiate with strength. It is a peace, however, which is a process and a long one.

I know that the world is filled with evils and ills, and I know we are being told about them, day by day, by the man from Arizona. I know that we are tired of these ills and these evils, and we shall do what we can with them but the simple truth is, my friends, the history of mankind has not been written in this way. The men who fought here at the Alamo, these men, if you please, were bound together in a common purpose and opportunity.

Their commander didn't divide them, didn't cast doubt and suspicion. They made a sacrifice for what? They made a sacrifice for the liberties of the people; they made a sacrifice for the future of the people. They lost the battle but they won the war of freedom in American democracy.

57 HHF

On this platform tonight, there is a man whom you possibly haven't recognized as to his contribution to the strength of this Nation—your Congressman Henry Gonzalez, who speaks the Spanish language, who has given such inspiring leadership in the Congress to the programs of better relationships in this hemisphere. That man, by extending the hand of friendship, by living the spirit of the good neighbor, by making San Antonio an international market, by seeing to it that this great western hemisphere again becomes an alliance for progress—Henry Gonzalez has done more for peace, done more for the kind of world we want to live in by patient, persevering, quiet, tenacious effort than all the bellicose statements of the Reserve general who seeks to be President of the United States. [Applause.]

So, as we depart from you tonight, may I say that the peace we seek is the one that John Kennedy spoke of a little over a year ago, in the Nation's Capital, at American University. It was on that occasion that our late and beloved President said:

Peace is a process. It requires even greater sacrifices than in battle or in war. Peace is not easily attained. It is fought for and struggled for for generations.

And, ladies and gentlemen, when I hear the spokesman of the opposition in this country tell us that we are losing and that communism is winning, I say, "Shame on them", because America today—[Applause.]

Because America today is the mightiest power, as I said a moment ago, that the world has ever known. Western Europe is powerful, rich and strong. The Alliance for Progress, working today in over 10 of the nations south of the Rio Grande, has exceeded even the requirements of the Conference at Punta del Este.

Freedom is gaining. The Communists are fighting among themselves. The Sino-Soviet split is a reality. The eastern nations of Europe are seeking more independence. Mr. Khrushchev has more trouble in one day than America has in a year. [Applause.]

What we need is the faith this Nation needs. What we need is faith in the strong purposes of this need. What we need are people who can understand that to achieve great objectives, it's like building a cathedral. It's not done by the wish nor is it done by the order of the day.

The mighty cathedrals of Europe took, yea, decades, generations, and some of them centuries, but there they stand as a living testimonial to a great faith and those mighty cathedrals have withstood the vandals, the atheists, and withstood war and pestilence, but they are there.

But, just as mankind built these cathedrals out of brick and mortar and stone and concrete, so mankind today must build a cathedral of peace that is predicated upon a solid economic basis, that is predicated, if you please, upon a recognition of human dignity, a granting of full equality for all people, a building of an alliance of all people that believe in freedom, the tolerance and understanding of people and their problems, and if America can give leadership at home to building the Great Society that President Lyndon Johnson has talked of, a society in which every American can do his best, in which every one can give his uttermost, if we can build a society at home with a great and free people, a tolerant and understanding people, with national unity and national purposes, if we can do that here, then we possibly are equipped to do the job of leadership throughout this world.

This is our goal; this is our objective, and may I say this—it's an objective to which every young man and woman ought to dedicate his life.

They can do these things and even greater, so—let us think American.

58 HHH

Hot Springs, Ark.
Regional Meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperatives Association
September 18, 1964

TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY,
DEMOCRATIC VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE

one — America's rural electrification program is known throughout the world as ^{one} of this Nation's greatest success stories. I am delighted to be with the people who have made it possible.

Over the years I have been proud of your accomplishments. I have worked side by side with you to solve some of your problems. In fact, I almost feel I am one of you. I hope you share this feeling and will remember your kinfolks next November 3.

Rural electrification is one of the most successful partnerships ever created in this country between the Federal Government and the people—for it is the people who own and operate their own cooperative electric power systems.

These are the same people—rural Americans—who literally lived in utter darkness before the Rural Electrification Administration said, "Let there be light." These are the same people who for years pleaded in vain for the electricity cities and towns took for granted—the same workers whose labor was never lightened by electric power. These were the neglected, forgotten, and the scorned. Millions of people—American citizens, taxpayers—people with a crying need for electric power.

How was this need met? How did electricity come to the people of rural America?

Let me make one point absolutely clear: *It did not come from Senator Goldwater and it did not flow from the philosophy of Goldwaterism.*

Rural America got electricity because a Congress and a Democratic administration believed with Lincoln that the Government should work for the people. And the people believed and called upon their Government.

The philosophy of Goldwaterism holds that people should be suspicious of the Government, that they should mistrust the Government, that they should fear the people who work for the Government.

But, unfortunately for rural people, the great Republican Senator George Norris of Nebraska did not share this strange belief; nor did the young Democratic Congressman from Texas named Sam Rayburn; nor did President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who made rural electrification a personal crusade.

These are the three great men who fought for the legislation that created REA and brought rural America out of darkness: Norris, Rayburn, and Roosevelt.

These are great names from America's past—names associated with strength and progress, not fear and retreat.

Because of these men, and the thousands of others who have carried on this great crusade, darkness has disappeared from rural America. Our rural people now have the same conveniences and tools that city people have taken for granted for generations.

But the great danger is that rural America may begin to take rural electrification for granted. If they do, the great network of rural electric cooperatives which the people have built can quickly collapse and disappear. What has been built to serve the people of rural America will serve instead the monopolists and opportunists. Anyone who doubts this possibility should take a hard look at the record and philosophy of Senator Goldwater.

Senator Goldwater has consistently voted against rural electrification and he has just as consistently voted against all the related programs that make rural electrification possible. I'm talking about TVA and the other great wholesale power authorities, about transmission lines and multiple purpose-dams, about all the programs which build the strength of rural America. In 12 years in the U.S. Senate, Barry Goldwater voted against the position taken by the rural electric cooperatives no less than 35 times.

59 HHF

On two occasions he voted for REA proposals, and both times the projects directly benefitted his own State of Arizona.

That is his record of inaction and opposition to REA as a U.S. Senator. And he has supported this record by many public statements over the years. Goldwater has said that REA has outlived its usefulness and ought to be dissolved. He has said that the electric cooperatives should fold up and get out of areas if the commercial power companies find them profitable enough to take over. He said TVA and the other power authorities and agencies should be sold even if the Government got only 1 dollar for them. He said the Government should be "phased out" of public power and agricultural programs on a "rigid timetable."

One cannot change the philosophy of a lifetime in one wild night at the Cow Palace and I don't think Senator Goldwater wants to change. I've watched him operate for years in the U.S. Senate and I think he's uncomfortable now saying things which contradict the philosophy of a lifetime.

No matter how hard he tries, when he attempts to say something good about social security or TVA or REA, the words catch in his throat.

He really doesn't believe that expediency in the pursuit of votes is no vice.

Is this the man rural America wants for President of the United States?

Is this the man rural America wants to appoint the next Secretary of Agriculture? The next REA Administrator? The next Secretary of the Interior? The next Federal Power Commission?

But you do not have to accept Goldwaterism with its negative echoes of the past. You have a clear-cut and meaningful choice. The temporary spokesman of the Republican Party is against REA, TVA, and the other programs you believe in. President Lyndon B. Johnson has been and still is in complete support of these programs. The choice is no more complicated than this—a choice between "Yes" and "No."

Lyndon B. Johnson is one of you. He came out of the rural electrification program just as you did. Like many of you, he helped organize the electric co-op that serves his ranch in Texas today. As a Congressman, as a U.S. Senator, as Senate majority leader, as Vice President, and as President, he has not only supported REA, he has been an aggressive, proud, fighting champion of your cause.

You've come a long way in the rural electrification program, but you still have a long way to go. Through your deeds and your example, most of the homes and institutions in rural America now have electricity. But to say that the rural electrification program has outlived its usefulness, as Senator Goldwater says, is like saying highway construction should have stopped after the first narrow roads were built.

The demand for power in rural areas is doubling every 7 years, and electrical and electronic advances for rural America are still only in their initial stages. The rural co-ops must constantly improve their lines and service and build bigger and better facilities, just as the commercial utilities must do. The objective of the rural electrification program must continue to be both service and rates which compare favorably with those in towns and cities.

The rural electrification program has been good for everyone—rural people, townspeople, businessmen, and farmers. The Government has never lost a dime on a loan to a rural electric cooperative. The repayment record has been called the finest in the history of banking. You know that—the Federal Government knows that—even if Senator Goldwater doesn't.

Where once there was darkness and drudgery, there is now light and electrically assisted labor. Where once there was only need, there is now a billion dollar market for electrical equipment.

All of this has been accomplished within the framework of the American way of life. This is an effective, dynamic partnership between the Federal Government and the people of America.

This is the kind of program, the kind of Government activity and the kind of local initiative that most Members of Congress and most Americans believe in.

But not Senator Goldwater.

My friends, President Johnson and I ask you to make your choice on election day.

60 HHF

Hot Spring, Ark.
National Rural Electric Cooperatives Association
September 18, 1964

TRANSCRIPT OF ADDRESS OF SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY, DEMOCRATIC VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, Senator Fulbright, my good friends, Bill and Betty, Congressman Harris, stalwart champion of rural electrification and of independent business, and of that great State of Arkansas, and of America.

By the way, I said to Senator Fulbright just as I got up here, after that glowing, generous, enthusiastic introduction, I said, "Well, Bill, I hope they don't run you out of the State after that."

He's a man of such supreme confidence that he feels he can get by even with what he said about me, and I hope, Bill, that that is true.

Now, may I pay my respects first of all to Chairman Paul Jones, to Harry Oswald, to Al Hauffe, the director, to the many people that have gathered here for this wonderful regional meeting under the most delightful circumstances.

I just can't help but feel, as I traveled around America, and I find all of this good weather, it is always good weather when you have a Democratic spokesman. It just sounds good.

I was in Texas yesterday and the day before I went to Texas, the President called me and he said, "Hubert, we have had a drought in Texas. The one thing I want you to do tonight is to pray for rain. Pray loud, pray long, pray clearly."

I prayed, and I am happy to tell you that it rained the next day in Texas. [Applause.]

Now, I didn't say that we were responsible for it, but I can say that no Republican can make that same claim. [Laughter and applause.]

It's delightful to find so many of the participants and officers of rural Americans for Lyndon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey in this wonderful rural electrification cooperative, sponsors and members, and I can only say that you have got your work cut out for you; but never in your lifetime did you have a clearer record, a clearer choice to give to the people of rural America than you have in this particular election, and I think that our friends of the rural Americans, rural citizens for Lyndon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey, that in this election, you are going to be able to bring that choice clearly to the American people.

By the way, Senator Fulbright, you said that our good friend Clyde Ellis, here, was one of your students and that he was really responsible for getting you into politics. Your wife whispered to me as you were making that statement—and I always like to listen to the wife; when I have a choice of listening to Bill or Betty, I take Betty—but when you were making that statement, she whispered to me and she said, "Well, Hubert, this is one time that the student taught the teacher."

I just want to commend Clyde Ellis, not only for his work in the Rural Electrification National Association, not only for his fine record in Congress, but I want to commend him for doing something for America that every American—every thoughtful American—ought to be grateful for, namely, encouraging to run for the Congress and making possible the leadership in the United States Senate of truly one of the greatest Americans of our time, Senator William Fulbright. [Applause.]

By the way, too, I want to mention that if any of you have any complaints about the REA administration in Washington, I insisted that when I came out here that since I had been on a rather busy tour that they send Norm Clapp and Dick Dell out here so that you can tell them your problems.

Norman, you stand in the corner under the shade of one of these beautiful trees and listen to any of these complaints and resolve them. Don't bring them to those of us in Congress.

I wonder how many of you recall it was almost within this very spot on the steps, I believe, of the park, that a great statesman from Arkansas made his acceptance speech for the office of Vice President.

61 HHF

As I recollect, Joe Robinson, a truly great Democrat, a great American, in 1928, received the notice of his nomination and made his acceptance speech—not like we do at this time under the lights of television but right back home with the people that he loved so much and the people that had given him such generous support, and I must say that I feel that this is a historical moment for me to be the second candidate for Vice President, not to make an acceptance speech in this great national park but to follow in the footsteps of one of the outstanding statesmen of the New Deal period, Joe Robinson, the former and late majority leader of the U.S. Senate, a great citizen of this great State, the land of opportunity. [Applause.]

I regret that the Governor of this Commonwealth, this State, is not with us this morning. I know that we shall see him this afternoon but let me say that it is a matter of public record that Governor Orval Faubus of the State of Arkansas has done a great deal, in fact, has championed the development of rural electrification in the State of Arkansas, and rural and industrial development in this State, and for these achievements, those of us that want to see light brought to the countryside, opportunity brought to rural Americans, salute him for this worthy endeavor. [Applause.]

You know, when people come to talk to you about agriculture, they generally put on ashes and sackcloth. That is particularly true about the members of the opposition, who frankly admitted they know nothing about it, and I shall get to that in a moment but I come to you today to talk about one of the great miracles of our time, a great success story.

First of all, I believe American agriculture in itself is a miracle. It is a success story second to none and when I hear these people who bewail what is happening to our country—and we have some now out on the stump that make it sort of their political business to tell us of the woes and the tribulations of America, and of our weakness and of our failures and of our faults, as if this was the way to encourage the people to greater effort—when I hear all of this, I can't help but think of one thing. It may be true that the Soviet Union and Mr. Nikita Khrushchev were able to put sputnik in orbit. It may be true that they are able to have great space development. It may be true that they have powerful armies, but let me tell you it is not true that their countryside is electrified, and what is more, with all of their boasted achievements and all of our alleged troubles that are told to us day after day by a certain spokesman of a certain political party, let the record be clear that there is one thing above all that the Soviet Union doesn't have, and that is a family farm, privately owned and operated by good, free people. [Applause.]

The success story of REA is marvelous and I am delighted with the people who have made this accomplishment possible. Over the years, I have been very proud of your accomplishment; and as your officers know, and as Mr. Ellis knows, and these great leaders of the Arkansas delegation in Congress know, I worked side by side at home in Minnesota and in the Congress to help you solve some of the problems and meet some of the challenges and opportunities.

In fact, I almost feel that I'm one of you and I do, now that I got my tie clasp this morning, and I want you to take a look at it.

That tie clasp with that hand lifted high, that's the hand of the arm of optimism and confidence, and I believe he's got his fingers parted, which is the victory sign for the Democratic party. [Applause.]

And since I'm a member of the family, I hope that you will share this feeling and continue to include me in the family and remember your kinfolks on November 3. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, rural electrification is a partnership, and it's one of the most successful partnerships in this country; and a successful one between the Federal Government and the people, for it is the people who own and operate these REA's; and these are the same people, the rural Americans, who literally lived in darkness for so many years before the Rural Electrification Administration said, almost with scriptural prophecy, "Let there be light."

And these are the same people who pleaded in vain for years for electricity that the cities and towns took for granted.

62 HHF

How was that need met? How did we get at it? How did electricity finally come to rural America. Oh, I know; you know, but you know there are millions of people who don't know. Millions of our young people do not realize how these battles were fought, and one of the purposes of reciting the accomplishments of the American people is to instill into our young a respect for the achievements of our democracy and of our people.

Well, I can tell you, to make one point perfectly clear, this electricity didn't come from Senator Goldwater and it didn't flow from the philosophy of Goldwaterism, either. Rural America got electricity because a Congress and a Democratic administration believed that the Government should work for the people, and the people believed, and the people called upon their Government.

The philosophy of Goldwaterism holds that people should be suspicious of their Government, that they should mistrust their Government, that the Government is your enemy, and that you, the people should fear your Government, and you should fear the people who work for your Government.

Well, I do not agree with that philosophy. I think it does a disservice to a nation that is called the United States of America—"we, the people". I think it does a disservice to the pledge of allegiance that we take to this Republic and what America needs today are not spokesmen that seek to divide us. What America needs today are people who seek to unite us for common purposes and common goals.

What America needs today are men in public office that you can trust, people that seek to lead us to common goals as one people, not as northerners or southerners, not as farmers or city folks, not as workers or farm and rural families, but one people united in the cause of human freedom. [Applause.]

We do not claim that REA is the child or the achievement of just one. Fortunately, for rural people, there have been great Republicans, and there are today, who put their country far above their party. This is why there are hundreds and thousands, yea, millions of people in every State in this land who are not going to follow the false leadership of the temporary spokesman of the Goldwater faction of the Republican Party. Not on your life. They're going to be like George Norris of Nebraska. He didn't share the belief that the Government could not be trusted or that it was the enemy of the people, nor did that young Democratic Congressman from Texas, Sam Rayburn, nor did President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who made rural electrification a personal crusade.

These are the great men who fought for the legislation that created REA, and who brought rural America out of the darkness. Norris, Rayburn, Roosevelt—these are the men that saw the promise of America. They looked to the future; they didn't divide America; they united it.

That's the kind of leadership we need. [Applause.]

These men and their names are associated with strength and progress, not fear and retreat, and because of these men and the thousands of others who have carried on this great crusade, darkness and despair has disappeared from rural America.

Today, fortunately, many of our rural people have the same conveniences and tools that city people have taken for granted for generations, but lest we relax and become apathetic and indifferent, the great danger is that rural America itself may begin to take rural electrification for granted, and if it does, Clyde, if your REA's and these great associations of free people who own and operate their own great rural electric cooperatives, if you take this program for granted, you will lose it, because the very people who take it for granted and have built it can lose it quickly and it can collapse and disappear.

Anyone who doubts this possibility should take a hard look at the record and the philosophy of Senator Goldwater, who has said, pointedly, in 1963, that the Rural Electric Administration should be abolished. That's his promise to you, the conscience, if you please, speaking—not of a conservative but the conscience of one who has lost faith in the ability of the American people to govern themselves and to point to the future.

63 HHF

Senator Goldwater has consistently voted against rural electrification. I can stand on any platform without fear of any contradiction and say there has never been a record of a man in public life who sought high national public office that has such a dismal, negative record of opposition to everything that you, as officers and directors and members of REA, stand for, as the Goldwater team of 1964. [Applause.]

Now, I know it is a bit difficult to keep up with where a man stands. It's hard to hit a moving target. [Applause and laughter.]

And I might add that the Goldwater-Miller team of depression and disaster for agriculture has just as consistently voted against all the related programs that make rural electrification possible. I'm talking about TVA. When he wrote a book, he said we ought to sell it. When he got down in the TVA area, he said we ought to keep it, and the other day, he got someplace else and he said, "Well, I think we ought to sell it. I've found a fellow who'll pay \$2." [Laughter.]

And the other great wholesale powers, he said we ought to sell, too. About transmission lines and multiple-purpose dams—that's what I'm talking about, about all the programs which have built the strength of rural America.

The spokesman, the Republican pretender to the Presidency, says, "Get rid of them. Sell them." And where will you be, my fellow Americans?

In 12 years in the U.S. Senate, Barry Goldwater voted the positions taken by the rural electric cooperatives no less than 35 times—35 times. Now, I want to be frank with you.

His record is not completely negative. On two occasions, he voted for REA proposals, but both times, they were projects that were directly related to Arizona. He knew he needed to get elected.

Well, REA is not just Arizona or Arkansas. REA is the entire Union, the whole of America; and one of the great, gratifying experiences of my life is to find men and women who have fought the good fight to build these REA cooperatives, to find that they have an interest in every part of America and in everything that's going on in America. In other words, citizens of the United States of America, not just in Arizona.

This is his record. It's one of inaction. It's one of opposition to REA, and he has supported this record by public statement. Goldwater has said, and I quote him exactly: "REA has outlived its usefulness and it ought to be dissolved."

They must have some kerosene lamps left in that department store. [Laughter and applause.]

Well, I can come clean with you. In Humphrey's drugstore, we sold them out a long time ago. [Laughter and applause.]

As a matter of fact, we made them as an up-to-date donation to the Goldwater faction of the Republican Party in South Dakota.

He said that electric cooperatives should fold up and get out of the areas, that the commercial power companies find them profitable enough to take over. In other words, you folks get in there, clean out the land mines, be the vanguard, get yourself worked over, blown to bits, and after everything is safe and nice, turn it over to Barry and his boys. Not on your life. [Applause.]

Yes, he said the TVA, the power authorities and agencies, should be sold "even if the Government got only \$1 for them." You know, this man is really becoming quite free with the public resources. The other day, he proposed a program that expanded Federal outlays by over \$30 billion. He reduced taxes—when he didn't have to vote on them—by 25 percent, and then just yesterday or the day before, he gets into the Federal Treasury and decided to divide up what was left amongst anybody around the country that needed it.

Unbelievable. Unbelievable. Is it any wonder that people worry? He said the Government should be phased out of public power and agriculture programs on a rigid timetable.

Well, I've got a suggestion for you. When he wants to phase things out, I suggest you phase Goldwater out of public office on a rigid timetable—November 3. [Applause.]

Now, this is the record, and it is a dismal one. This is the philosophy, and he can't run away from either one. You cannot change the philosophy of a lifetime in one wild night at the Cow Palace in San Francisco, and you can't change the philosophy of a lifetime by

64 HHF

drinking hot chocolate in Hershey, Pa., when the two Republican parties met there under the Eisenhower tent in one afternoon, and I don't think Senator Goldwater wants to change. I give him credit for this. Once in a while, he's tempted. Once in a while he's led into the 20th century for just a moment. Once in a while he peeps through the door of the portal of progress. He sees just a little light at the end of the tunnel, but it frightens him and he goes back, closes the door. [Applause.]

And I suppose one ought to respect a man who takes his firm stand—his firm stand—of turning about-face and retreating into never-never land; no matter how hard he tries, and what he attempts to say, whenever he attempts to say something good about social security, or TVA, or REA, the words just catch in his throat.

I ask this question today in this beautiful city of Hot Springs, Ark., as I look at some of the finest citizens of our land: Is this the man that rural America wants for the President of the United States?

CHORUS OF VOICES. No. No. No. No.

Senator HUMPHREY. Is this the man rural America wants to appoint the next Secretary of Agriculture?

CHORUS OF VOICES. No!

Senator HUMPHREY. Is this the man you want to appoint the next REA Administrator?

CHORUS OF VOICES. No!

Senator HUMPHREY. The next Secretary of Interior?

CHORUS OF VOICES. No!

Senator HUMPHREY. And the next Federal Power Commissioner?

CHORUS OF VOICES. No!

Senator HUMPHREY. I think I know the answer. I have heard it, but do you want—but you don't have to, by the way, accept Goldwaterism, with its negative echoes of the past. You do have a clear choice.

The temporary spokesman for the Republican Party is against REA, TVA and the other programs you believe in. And President Lyndon B. Johnson has been and still is in complete support of these programs.

The choice is no more complicated than this. It's a choice between "Yes" and "No," and I think you're going to vote "Yes for Johnson" and "No for Goldwater." [Applause.]

Lyndon B. Johnson is one of you. He is for you. He came out of the rural electric program, just as you did. Like many of you, he helped organize the electric co-op that serves his ranch in Texas today, and the lights are on at the ranch, even if he turns a few of them off at the White House, I can assure you. [Applause.]

And as a Congressman, a U.S. Senator, and the Senate majority leader, and Vice President, and as President of the United States, he has not only supported REA, he has been aggressive in that support, a proud and a fighting champion of your case. That's the kind of a man that rural America needs to help rural Americans live a better life in this great country.

cause (?)

You have come a long way. You have still a long way to go. Through your deeds and your example, most of the homes and the institutions in rural America now have electricity, but to say that the rural electrification program has outlived its usefulness—as Mr. Goldwater says—is like saying that highway construction should be stopped after the first narrow roads were built.

The demand for power in rural areas is doubling about every 7 years, and the electrical and the electronic advances in rural America are still in the initial stages.

The rural co-ops, therefore, must constantly improve their lines and service and build bigger and better and more economical facilities, just as the commercial utilities do. The objective of the rural electrification program, therefore, must be to continue both service and rates which compare favorable with those in the towns and cities.

This program has been good for everyone. It's been good for the farmer, for the rural people, townspeople, and businessmen and the farmers. The Government has never lost a dime on a loan to a rural electric cooperative. The repayment record has been the finest in the history of banking. You know that. The Federal Government knows that, even if Senator Goldwater doesn't.

65 HHF

Where once there was darkness and drudgery, there is now light and electrically assisted labor. Where once there was only need, there is now a billion dollar market for appliances and electrical equipment.

REA has done more for private enterprise in America than almost any other single action of the Federal Government and yet this spokesman for free enterprise says, "Kill it." How foolish can you be? [Applause.]

Now, let me take just one or two more moments of your time. The other day up in Des Moines—a wonderful community in the great State of Iowa—one of the representatives of the Goldwater-Miller team for disaster and depression in agriculture made some observations on agricultural policy. It's nice to get observations from people who frankly confess in the beginning, "I'm not a farm expert and I don't know anything about farming." That's great.

Now, having said this, I want to call attention to the Democratic platform of 1960, because in that platform, the Democrats pledged to raise farm income and reduce surpluses and increase consumption of food at home and abroad, establish a food stamp plan to protect the American consumer, increase farm credit, expand research, encourage cooperatives and protect our natural resources, and expand the farmers' protection against natural disasters and protect the family farms.

We said those things. We meant them, and we have kept our pledge and kept our promise.

It's pretty hard, however, for a man who admits he's no expert and who has joined with one who says he knows nothing about farming, and who has glasses without lenses, and has calendars without years and has watches without hands—it's mighty hard, may I say, to really evaluate the seriousness of the charge that may be made, but I think that if the Republican spokesman would really just take a good look and read the platform, he'd find that the pledges were fulfilled.

For example, we have protected the consumer who now pays only 18 percent of his disposable income for food, compared to 20 percent in 1960. We have complimented the American farmer on his accomplishment, rather than berating him.

These spokesmen are concerned about things like farm mortgage indebtedness. So am I. If you have a debt of \$10, and \$20 in the bank, I think you're a whole lot better off than if you have a debt of \$10, and \$5 in the bank.

In the last 4 years, farm assets have gone up four times faster than the farm debt. Now, anybody that knows anything about bookkeeping knows that's a pretty good ratio. These temporary farm spokesmen from the deserts of Arizona, and from the cool banks of the Niagara, they are worried about the number of employees in the Department of Agriculture.

Well, let me say that one-fourth of them are taking care of our forests. A large number of these employees are engaged in meat inspection, poultry inspection, at the will and at the command of the Congress.

Another group are engaged in soil conservation to protect the heritage of God-given land to the future generations of the American people.

Now, maybe these men want to have our forests rot, our meat and poultry go uninspected, or our soils washed down the river. I don't, and I don't intend to vote for any program that does, and let me say this.

While this is not a great wheat producing area, it is a cotton area, the great State of Arkansas, and it raises rice and it raises soy beans, and the simple fact of the matter is that when the wheat bill came up that meant millions of dollars to wheat producers throughout America, millions of dollars to men and women on main street, an overwhelming majority of Democrats and Republicans voted for it, but not Senator Goldwater.

And when the cotton bill came up that meant so much to so many people in the Southland, where Mr. Goldwater now seeks to press his campaign, when dollars and cents, when economic security was on the line for hundreds of thousands of cotton producers, the majority of Democrats and a number of Republicans voted for the cotton bill, but not Senator Goldwater.

66 HHH

And this is the fact all the way through, and now, ladies and gentlemen, this is the record. That record needs to be brought to the people of America. My plea to you today is that as you look at this record, balance it off, because what you need is a program, not only for yourselves, but a program for all of America.

And I think that we, in the Democratic Party, have that program. This is the kind of a program, kind of activity that you have here in REA, the kind of local initiative that most Members of Congress and most Americans believe in, but as I have said repeatedly "Not Senator Goldwater," and it is my view that on November 3, that most Americans, Democrats and independents and Republicans, are going to cast their votes for Lyndon B. Johnson, and not Senator Goldwater.

Thank you very much. [Applause.]

Little Rock, Ark.
TV stations KARK and KATV
September 18, 1964

TRANSCRIPT OF PRESS CONFERENCE OF SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY, "MEET THE STATE PRESS"

ANNOUNCER. It is indeed channel 11's privilege to bring before the State tonight Senator Hubert Humphrey, candidate for the Vice-Presidency of the United States.

Questioning Senator Humphrey will be Lloyd Hobeck, UPI; Bob Starr, Associated Press; Pat Owens of the Arkansas Gazette; and Bobby Foster. Your moderator is Bob Hicks.

Mr. HICKS. Senator Humphrey, may we too welcome you to Arkansas and thank you for appearing on "Face the State Press." We have four of Arkansas' top reporters here who are anxiously waiting to question you, so with your permission, will Miss Foster of the Arkansas Gazette ask the first questions?

Miss FOSTER. Senator, I wonder what your reactions were to the statement that was made recently in Arkansas, and this was the statement that any laying down to be done in the streets to block off traffic of legitimate business should be run over?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I would hope that no one would want to run over anybody. There is a necessity, however, of maintaining the public order and in maintaining public peace. It would be the responsibility of local officials to see to it that traffic was not interfered with.

At the same time, people should abide by the law but violence does not get law, and law and order is the only way I know of to prevent violence.

QUESTION. Senator, on the subject of these riots, such as disturbances in our northern cities this summer, how should they be handled or is there a prevention for them?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, first of all, we must all recognize that civil disobedience and civil lawlessness does not mean civil liberty or civil rights.

I think we should also recognize that it is the primary duty of government to maintain the peace and maintain law and order and therefore, measures must be taken to prevent looting, to prevent arrests, violence, and people who engage in violence and disorder and promote general community chaos.

Stern law enforcement, fair law enforcement is the first requirement of a local or State official. I don't believe that we ought to have Federal, should I say, Federal police. I do feel, however, that the investigating services, such as the FBI, can be of help to see whether or not there is a pattern in these acts of violence and disorder and if there is, such a pattern then, of course, there is a possibility of Federal action.

Now, having said all of this, asking for prompt, efficient, law enforcement and law observance, I think we also have to recognize that in some instances, there are many social injustices which promote these matters, taking the instance of Harlem, if you will permit me the time.

67 HHP

There are 50,000 people living in an area of $3\frac{1}{2}$ square miles. If that same density of population were applied to the rest of New York City, the entire population of the United States could be put in three boroughs—three boroughs in what we call Metropolitan New York.

When you have such density of population, school dropouts, when you have large unemployment among the youth, when you have illiteracy and tenements, crowded housing conditions, inadequate parking space—all of that, I think, tends to lend itself toward violence.

This does not mean you condone the violence. It means take law enforcement and seek to enforce a better society, to get on with the job of cleaning up cesspools of infection; that is what they are.

QUESTION. Again on civil rights, in the Southern States, children go to schools near their homes. In New York City, I am sure you are aware, children are being forced to go further away from their homes. This seems to be inconsistent. Wonder what you think?

Senator HUMPHREY. I have expressed myself earlier, and I am not for this long-range busing, using children, in other words, to accomplish a social objective and busing these children from one end of the city to another. What we need to do in America is to build better neighborhoods and it is still true, at least it is in my conviction, that neighborhood schools are better schools because you have closer parent-student-teacher relationship, so we, as we put in the Civil Rights Act of 1964, we said that that act shall not permit, insofar as any enforcement procedures under that act is concerned, school busing of children long distances.

QUESTION. Again, on civil rights, do you think Senator Fulbright's vote against the civil rights bill will prevent his being appointed to the Cabinet?

Senator HUMPHREY. I would hope not. I consider Senator Fulbright to be one of the most enlightened, one of the most able Senators in the history of our country. And his knowledge of foreign relations, his knowledge of our economy, his basic sense of fairplay and social enlightenment, qualifies him for any office from the President on down.

QUESTION. We have quite a few rumors that he might be appointed Secretary of State. Have you heard any?

Senator HUMPHREY. I have heard that many times and I don't have anything more to say than I have said. I can say that he is the great Senator from Arkansas and is the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. He is one of the most important and powerful men in the Government of the United States.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Owens.

Mr. OWENS. Senator, the quotation about running over people that Mrs. Foster read you was made by Governor Faubus who, I believe, has said that nobody else would run a lying demonstration; he would get behind the wheel and do it himself. Now, you are saying that you and the Governor have had past differences.

Do you have differences now with Mr. Faubus and are you, in fact, endorsing his candidacy for Governor of Arkansas?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I didn't come down here to get into a squabble about what Governor Faubus may or may not have said. I heard somewhere along the day—and a very busy day I had—that he made some correction of that alleged statement.

But be that as it may, my purpose in coming here is to campaign for a Democratic ticket, Lyndon B. Johnson and Hubert Humphrey, as candidates for President and Vice President, respectively. I think Governor Faubus has done some very good things in your State in terms of industrial development, in terms of agricultural progress.

I spoke earlier today to the Rural Electrification Cooperative and it had among them, particularly from the State of Arkansas, enthusiastic support for your Governor on the issue of rural electrification.

The Governor has not asked me to endorse him. I am afraid if I did, it might not help him, so I think about the best thing to do is just ride along.

QUESTION. You expect to see the Governor while you are here?

Senator HUMPHREY. I would hope to. I don't know just what the plans are. It is possible that they can be defined.

68 HHF

QUESTION. Senator, you said if you did endorse the Governor, you are afraid it might not help him. Would you clarify that, sir?

Senator HUMPHREY. I think that in certain instances being left alone is sometimes a help.

QUESTION. That might be because of the civil rights fame. You spent the last 2 days in States that theoretically are against your position, yet you seem to have gained a new respect in the matter. I wonder if you feel the rights issue will be against you—

Senator HUMPHREY. I find that most Americans are not of a one-track mind, and the civil rights issue is an important issue but it is not the only matter we are concerned about. What is more, it is now the law of the land and whoever is President of the United States will have to enforce that law. I would prefer to encourage people to observe it, to make the necessary community adjustments that will help bring respect for the law and I think this is being done. Quite frankly, I am deeply impressed by the progress that has been made in the South.

Sometimes we of the North fail to see what is being done someplace else. We have our own problems in our own areas. Now, the enthusiastic reception that I have had—and it's been just that—I think is due to the fact that people are concerned about many things.

We have been in Texas. They are concerned about agriculture. They are concerned about jobs. They are concerned about the attitude and Senator Goldwater on the matters of nuclear policy and foreign policy. Besides that, I like people and I'd like to think that people like me, and I think that the South has a great future.

In fact, I think that it is developing faster than any other part of America. I am here to encourage that development and I think it is developing educationally, socially, economically, and politically. And anything I can do to help that along, I want to do.

QUESTION. Senator, I understand you yourself have something of a southern background and spent some time, I believe, at Louisiana State University.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, sir.

QUESTION. Do you think that your youthful experience gave you some understanding of the South?

Senator HUMPHREY. I haven't heard much about this—

QUESTION. What do you remember?

Senator HUMPHREY. I know it was a very useful experience. Louisiana State University, at the time I attended there, had a very fine school of government. Mrs. Humphrey and I lived there for a year. Our little daughter, who today is married and has two daughters of her own, was a little baby there at that time.

I met many people I saw on the political campaign. I traveled around the State, but I would like to believe that as an American citizen and as a Senator that has studied his country, traveled widely in our country, that I do have some understanding of the economic and social and political problems, not only of my own State but of other States.

What we really need to do here is try to promote a kind of change of ideas and also a respect for the manner in which we deal with our respective problems. A bit of tolerance and a good bit of understanding, I think, is bringing us a long way.

This is a much better country than it used to be and it is going to get better as we go along.

QUESTION. Senator, when Governor Faubus announced that he would support the national party, was this a surprise to you and President Johnson? Do you feel that would in any way alienate the northern Democrats?

Senator HUMPHREY. I don't think it will alienate any of the northern Democrats. Arkansas and Louisiana, as I remember, are the two States that have never voted Republican.

Now, from my point of view, of course, that shows a kind of indigenous political wisdom to commend themselves to the attention of the whole Nation. We are very pleased to have a unified support in Arkansas, and I think this will help a great deal in the rest of the South.

Let's just say this. The Democratic Party and the Democratic administration, since the time of Franklin Delano Roosevelt have gone very good for the South and the South has been very good to the Democratic Party. We also depend on the South.

When I look at what has happened in Arkansas, I see a partnership here between the Federal Government and the State government and private industry and the rural economy that has literally lifted this State to new levels of economic growth and progress.

The Republican Party never tried to help this part of America. It is much more of a restrictive, withdrawal type of governmental philosophy. It does not sense that the Government can be a partner, can be a great help in releasing the capacities of a country or a State or of an individual.

Mr. HICKS. Miss Foster.

Miss FOSTER. Question: I noticed in your Hot Springs' speech you kept referring to Goldwaterism. What is the distinction you draw between Goldwaterism and conservatism?

Senator HUMPHREY. I consider conservatism to be a responsible political philosophy that has respect for tradition, that also has a recognition of current problems.

I consider Goldwaterism to have a kind of fictional understanding of our heritage, without any regard to the facts of history, and literally no foresight and a heavy dose of irresponsibility in dealing with contemporary matters, and little or no vision about the future.

To put it simply—Goldwaterism is just not reality. It's a kind of politically never-never land. I think the Saturday Evening Post said of the Senator that he was sort of a "stray." By that, he is not in the mainstream of the Republican Party and he surely isn't in the stream of the main or the tributaries of the Democratic Party.

There are thousands of Republicans in any part of the country and I am sure this is true all over everywhere, that they are going to Johnson, not because they are enthusiastic about the Democratic Party but because they just worry about their country.

They just feel they cannot trust the judgment of Senator Goldwater and they feel that they can trust the judgment and the experience and the knowledge of the Government of President Johnson. They are putting country before party.

QUESTION. Senator Dirksen has described you as a modern liberal. What is the "modern liberal"? What is your definition of a liberal?

Senator HUMPHREY. That has always been a little hard to define. We all get tags on ourselves. I guess it's easier to deal with somebody if you could put a tag on him or at least identify him.

I would say that a liberal is someone that accepts the facts of change, but seeks to bring these facts of change within a framework of ideals and convictions. And these ideals and convictions are personal liberty of representative government, of the maximum freedom, both political and economic, and of the Government being a servant of the people.

I would identify my kind of liberalism as one that supported, for example, the broad objectives of the New Deal. I believe strongly in free enterprise; I believe it needs to be competitive. I believe in the profit system. I believe in open political parties.

I oppose conspiratorial apparatus, wherever it may be, domestic or foreign. I consider communism a totalitarian philosophy that debases human dignity. I believe that the difference between the totalitarianism and democracy is the respect for human dignity.

I think that tells what my thoughts and philosophies are. I think I am modern because I know what year it is and I know that we have serious problems ahead of us and a great challenge ahead, and I am not afraid of these problems. In fact, I kind of welcome them. It is with a kind of optimistic desire to get at the problems and do something about them.

QUESTION. I take it from what you said, Senator, you are not afraid of the realignment of departers, such as the matter of Senator Thurmond's defection, and so on.

Senator HUMPHREY. As I said about Senator Thurmond, we do believe in freedom of choice in this country, and what I think Senator Thurmond did was to make his votes in the Congress and his political philosophy, which is surely his privilege to hold. He made it legitimate. He went over to, as he said, the Goldwater Republican party.

70 HHF

I call that to your attention because the Republican Party in my State would find very little accommodation with the views of Senator Thurmond. The Goldwater faction of the Republican Party, and it is a minor faction, that faction or fragment of the Republican Party, is temporarily in control of the apparatus of the Republican Party, and that is why I think Senator Goldwater must be defeated.

I believe in the two-party system and I believe that a two-party system must begin upon basic objectives. They must agree upon goals. They may disagree upon the approach to those goals or the means but they must agree upon ultimate objectives. And it is my view that most Republicans and most Democrats have common objectives.

It is also my view that the forces that support Senator Goldwater do not have these common objectives and common goals.

QUESTION. Are you saying the Democrats are going to take Senator Thurmond back in December or January if he wants to come?

Senator HUMPHREY. I would seriously doubt that. I hope that I will have a position in the Senate as the Presiding Officer and therefore will not be privileged to participate in the senatorial caucus but since Strom Thurmond has made his choice, I think he is entitled to move real estate, his desk, over to the Republican side. There is a lot of room over there. I feel there will be more later.

QUESTION. Do you think it is possible there are other Democrats in the Senate and in the House who take roughly the same views as Senator Thurmond does? Do you think it is possible that the Democratic Party will ever move—sort of shove those people?

Senator HUMPHREY. No; I have not endorsed the concept of sort of trying to make our party a monolithic thing, structuring the Democratic Party as a national party and we have to face up to this fact, that there are different stages of different types of development, economic and social, throughout this great country of ours. I'd like to think I am somewhat a student of government. I have heard many people say, "Well, we ought to have it like they have it in Britain, a Conservative party and Labor. In Norway, you have Labor, a Conservative party, and Socialist. Of course, it isn't that simple because in the Scandinavian countries, they have many, many parties. But what we seek to do here is to bring within the basic framework of the Democratic Party a rather broad spectrum of political views."

Now, sometimes people stay within the Democratic Party because it is convenient for them and in there I mean, in this immediate regional or State politics, but I tend to find that many of these people bend toward the platform and the objectives over the long period of time, so I do not endorse the simplified methodology of saying, "Let's have a Conservative or let's have a Liberal party." I think the two parties do quite well.

QUESTION. Do I infer properly from the remark you made a few moments ago, you do hold a fear that if Goldwater is elected, it might mean the end of the two-party system in this country?

Senator HUMPHREY. I would say it surely would mean the end of the kind of two-party structure we have had. What I worry with more than anything else with the Goldwater movement is that there are those in the advance guard of that movement that are anything but tolerant, anything but flexible. They don't seek to adjust it or compromise or to cooperate. They seek to dominate and they have proven this in State after State, and I think the demonstration at the Cow Palace was the evidence that anyone needed, when you watched that on television, the insistence of the Goldwaterites that you do it my way.

Now, there's been some change on the last, in the last meeting of the two Republican Parties at Hershey, Pa., the Eisenhower party and the Goldwater faction, but I noticed that after Mr. Goldwater got far enough away from Pennsylvania so that he had crossed the Mason-Dixon line, he went right back to the primitive type, went right back to where he was before.

When he was in Pennsylvania, he wasn't sure he wanted to sell TVA but when he got down in the area where TVA is doing the greatest good—so help me—he's going to sell again.

QUESTION. Do you think there is also reason for concern about the tenets you Democrats are going to go by? It seems to me you were worrying that one-party government or destruction of the two-party

71 HHF

system indicated ill mental health in the Republican Party was the problem and what do you think they ought to do about that?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, generally, if one is in somewhat ill health, he really ought to do a little self-examination because his habits may not be too good; his attitude may not be too good; he may well be, in a sense, oh, getting out of line a little too often for his political and economic health.

I think that the Republican Party has failed to win elections, primarily because it has failed to sense the role of government in modern society, that it has failed to sense that the American people look upon their Government as one of the forces in the life of the Nation that gives them a chance, a better chance. It opens up the pathways of opportunity.

I have been trying to analyze what it is what we in politics have tried to do for people. For example, I don't believe that I owe you a living. I mean, I do not believe that a Government of this country ought to make sure that you are well off.

I do think, however, that I owe it to you, if I can possibly do anything about it to see to it that you have an opportunity for a job. I think I owe it to you to see that you have an opportunity to train yourself for that job.

No, I can't instill within you the incentive to get up and go, to want to make something out of yourself but I can, through the use of the Government, remove these boulders of inhibition, of resistance, so there is a clear track for you to drive on or walk on, if you have a willingness to do this.

I guess that is about as simplified a way as I can think of to speak of it.

QUESTION. Do you see anything unusual—well, did you ever get an endorsement from the Hearst newspapers for high office?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, the Hearst newspapers, in earlier days, were great crusaders for much of the social legislation for the working man. The Hearst newspapers have shown a great concern over foreign policy. Bill Hearst, Jr., is very concerned about our foreign policy in Latin America.

For example, I think whatever the Hearst newspapers have really decided—I mean, the decision they made—it appears to me was based upon, not that they agreed with everything Lyndon Johnson, President Johnson did, and surely not everything that Hubert Humphrey may stand for—but you have to make choices. We don't have the perfect candidate for you and for I and for me, and for somebody else. We have, in a sense, two candidates, two forces at work now in American public life and on the day of November 3, most people ought to go, and I think all people that are eligible to vote ought to go and cast an intelligent vote on those choices.

And what Hearst newspapers have done, like others, is to make that choice and I think that, naturally, America is in better hands with Lyndon Johnson as President and Hubert Humphrey as Vice President than it is if Senator Goldwater and Mr. Miller were in similar positions. I think that they have balanced it off. I imagine that the Hearst newspapers could give us a whiplashing on some of our views and maybe we could respond in one case but you make the choice, and you have to make the choice.

QUESTION. Now, Senator—

Senator HUMPHREY. May I say we thank the Hearst newspaper for that endorsement. We want to thank all.

QUESTION. Do you think the full details of the Bobby Baker case will come out or have they come out?

Senator HUMPHREY. I think that the most recent action of the Senate will surely permit a full explanation of the last allegations that were made in all seriousness to you. The Bobby Baker case is being checked and rechecked by the Internal Revenue Service, by the Justice Department, by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and I think it is well known that anytime that the FBI develops sufficient information for a grand jury, that appropriate—that it will go before that grand jury and seek an indictment.

72 HHHF

The committees of the Congress, the committee of the Congress handling this has carried on a good investigation. I know some people would like it to be outright razzle-dazzle but this is a political year and he knows that the other day, someone said that we were sweeping it under the rug.

Now, if I were a Republican, I don't think I would talk about rugs because the last rug that any one got his feet on was one in the office of the White House, was a Mr. Adams. And it just seems to me that we ought to kind of keep these in reasonable perspective.

This is a political year. I have been in politics a long time. If there is any wrongdoing, it should be exposed and if there is any action, that has been a violation of the law, and it should be prosecuted. It's just that simple.

QUESTION. Would you?

SENATOR HUMPHREY. I surely would. In fact, I voted for the bipartisan Committee of Equalness of Republicans and Democrats as a sort of committee of surveillance, committee of ethics, a committee of disciplines over the entire U.S. Senate but I don't believe it does very much good to go around shaking in fear every Senator somehow or other is engaged in nefarious activities. Most of us are too busy.

QUESTION. Senator Goldwater in Memphis charged this week that there were various issues which he felt that the Kennedy administration should answer. The Bobby Baker case was one, Vietnam. He also mentioned Presidential policy and postures about Cuba. What do you think that this country should do about Cuba, but to what extent that we should, as a government, either officially or unofficially, do to aid Cuba in any overthrow of the Castro government if it appears the people may want it?

SENATOR HUMPHREY. I believe what we are doing about Cuba is the possibility that it should be continued. Mr. Goldwater has made fantastic charges about Cuba in his speech in Seattle, Wash. A short time ago, he charged that President John Kennedy used the whole strife of the missile crises of 1962 for political purposes. This is a shameful statement.

He knows it is false. It was outrageous, also to the committees of Congress that examined all the evidence. All the evidence was pursued about what to do about Cuba. We pursued the Cuban case in the Organization of American States. Every single Latin American country, save Mexico, has broken relations with Cuba.

We imposed an embargo on Cuba. I think we ought to aid wherever they take any clandestine operations, just really activities within Cuba. I think we ought to prevent shipment of arms from Cuba to Latin American countries. I think I have said this on the Senate floor. I think we ought to agree that it is more than a nuisance. It could well be a subversive threat to the entire Latin American hemisphere.

THE ANNOUNCER. We have run out of time. We want to thank you very much, Senator Humphrey, for "Meet the State Press."

Article

News release from the Democratic National Committee, Washington, D.C.

September 18, 1964

TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY, DEMOCRATIC VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE, DEMOCRATIC STATE CONVENTION, ROBINSON AUDITORIUM, LITTLE ROCK, ARK.

Today this great convention is meeting in an auditorium named for one of Arkansas' greatest Democrats—Senator Joe Robinson—the able, courageous, and wise State majority leader during the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

When America was floundering after 12 years of Republican normalcy, Franklin Roosevelt called on Joe Robinson to help him rescue this Nation from economic and social chaos. And this former school-teacher, country lawyer, Congressman, Governor, and Senator became the New Deal's old reliable in the U.S. Senate.

Joe Robinson died in harness—fighting for the Democratic Party and the American people. And Joe Robinson has been followed in

Congress by one of the most remarkable and able group of men to represent any State in this Union.

John McClellan and Bill Fulbright—chairman of the Government Operations and Foreign Relations Committees, respectively—are among the most highly respected Members of the Senate. The chairman of this convention, Wilbur Mills, has more to say about tax legislation than any other man in Congress. Jim Trimble is an able and effective member of the House Rules Committee and works unstintingly in behalf of his district. Oren Harris has made an immense contribution to the Nation and to Arkansas as chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. And no Member of Congress knows better or champions more faithfully the interest of the cotton industry than "Took" Gathings.

The late President Kennedy was absolutely right when he said last October: "Pound for pound Arkansas has the most influential delegation in Congress."

Finally, I want to take this opportunity to thank Governor Faubus for his hospitality here tonight. We Democrats are a tumultuous lot, and it is no secret that Governor Faubus and I have had some differences in the past. Mr. Dooley once saw his friend Hennessey shining up a set of brass knuckles and asked where he was going. "To a Democratic *unity* meeting," said Hennessey, "I always go prepared." Well, I am pleased to know that this year no one has to take brass knuckles to a Democratic unity meeting.

Confronted by the absurdities, and the reckless attitude toward national interest, of the Goldwater faction, we Democrats stand united as never before. So I want to say how glad I am that Governor Faubus and I are standing together here tonight united in the cause of Arkansas and the cause of America.

And what a cause it is. Could there possibly be a greater contrast than the one we confront in 1964 between the bitter, angry pessimism of the Goldwater faction and the joyous enthusiasm and hope of the Democrats? Between the reckless impetuosity of Senator Goldwater and the responsible patient statesmanship of Lyndon Baines Johnson? The Democratic Party of 1964 is a political vessel for the aspirations of all the people. It is the party of the North *and* the South, of the East *and* the West. It is—in the words of our great President Lyndon Baines Johnson—the all-American party for all Americans.

The founder of the Democratic Party—Thomas Jefferson—once said:

"Men by their constitutions are naturally divided into two parties; those who fear and distrust the people, and wish to draw all powers from them in the hands of the higher classes; and those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish and consider them as honest and safe * * *"

It has been the salvation of the Democratic Party—and this Nation—that we have drawn our strength from the people; that our policies manifest our concern for the people; and that our party refuses to betray its confidence and faith in the people.

Our opponents in this election have cynically set out to divide America. Set North against South, East against West, city against farm, rich against poor, young against old, and black against white.

What America needs is understanding and tolerance. What a strong America needs is unity, not division. What a prosperous America needs is opportunity for all, not just for some. What a just America needs is equal protection of the laws for every citizen.

As President Johnson said recently:

We must not lock ourselves in with our prejudices. We must be prepared to learn, to be able to change our minds, to demonstrate compassion and humility towards others of different faiths, different origins, different sections, different professions.

We Democrats are not living in the past with old hates and prejudices, we are living in a dynamic present which will hopefully put an end to antiquated strife. Our basic pledge is to provide responsibility in government and opportunity for all our people.

74 HHF

American Government is more than Washington. American Government is Washington, the State Capital, the county courthouses, the city and village halls, the town meetings and the thousands of commissions and local school boards.

This great system of government requires cooperation and partnership. Government and people are partners in the common cause of securing the national interest, not mutual antagonists contending against one another for power and glory.

Without bothering to wrap all of this in fancy political theory, we Americans have achieved a sound and workable Federal system. This is truly a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Today there is greater freedom in America, not less; more opportunities, not fewer. America is stronger, better, richer, and mightier than ever before. Despite what Senator Goldwater says, you know it in your hearts and—so does he.

And you know that a government that cares about the unfortunate and the afflicted is a government that deserves your respect. You know that compassion is not weakness and that concern for the unfortunate is not socialism.

The people of this fine State have every reason to know that the Federal system has been a great instrument of liberation, that the National Government, far from being an engine of oppression, has aided in the growth of the economic and political health of this community.

It is a curious thing, isn't it, that when a billion Federal dollars are appropriated for the central Arizona project, the Goldwater faction cheers a triumph of local initiative. Yet somehow the funds spent for the Arkansas River Navigation Project are an invasion of States' rights, a violation of the 10th amendment, and an effort to corrupt the people of this State and turn them into pawns of the wicked bureaucracy.

Similarly they attack the poverty program, President Johnson's imaginative effort to make the United States truly a land of opportunity for all, suggesting—I guess—that no one should be poor, since everyone has an equal opportunity to inherit a department store.

And the issue in this campaign is whether the people of America can join together, living and working together for the common good. The alternative is the slippery slope of distrust, hatred, and disaster.

Our party says it is not wrong to be concerned about farm income in Arkansas and about urban problems in New York. Our party says the development of Arkansas water resources is in the national interest. Our party does not talk of dividing jobs among the unemployed but of building a strong economy which can absorb the talents of all Americans.

And our words are not hollow. The past 4 years have been years of solid achievement. The Federal Government has invested in Arkansas not only for the sake of Arkansas but because investment in Arkansas is investment in America's future. All of America must prosper.

Many Federal programs rest on this principle. Through them, Federal dollars are being invested in Arkansas in the form of roads, airports, libraries, college dormitories, dams, and other facilities. Federal agricultural programs help farmers improve their land, produce more and get a fair price for their crops. Small business and area redevelopment loans help to create new industries and expand old ones. Vocational education, public welfare, veterans benefits, school lunches, and many other programs contribute to a steadily improving standard of living in this State. Only last week the Congress approved \$113 million for Corps of Engineers projects in Arkansas.

Fiscal 1965 (including \$87.8 million to keep the Arkansas River program on schedule, thanks to a special request by President Johnson). In fiscal 1964 total Federal expenditures in Arkansas were \$904 million. The extent to which the Federal Government is investing in our State can be readily understood when one considers that the total Federal taxes collected in the State in the same year was \$359 million.

The most tangible and easily appreciated return on the investment which the Federal Government has made in Arkansas over the years is the increase in personal income that has accompanied the economic

75 HHF

diversification and expansion of the State. In 1940 per capita income in Arkansas was only \$256—43 percent of the national average. By 1963 per capita income had reached \$1,598—65 percent of the national average and your present rate of increase is one of the highest in the Nation. And, as the economy of the State improves you are more and more paying your own way.

In 1936 Federal outlays in Arkansas totaled over \$77 million while Federal revenues collected in the State were only slightly more than \$3½ million—a ratio of 22 to 1. Now *over two* Federal dollars are spent in Arkansas for every *one* collected in Federal taxes. I have no doubt that as the State continues to develop this gap will close further.

Here is what we mean by partnership. What has happened between Washington and your State is good policy, sound economics, and good government. As one of your Senators said in a report to his constituents, this is not charity, it is sound investment. A healthy, prosperous Arkansas makes a great contribution to a healthy, prosperous America.

We have a legislative record on which we Democrats can all be proud.

Over the persistent but futile opposition of the Republican nominee who advocates “the prompt and final termination of the farm subsidy program” we have enacted legislation to strengthen the position of agriculture in our economy. Arkansas farm income is up 21 percent over the last days of the disastrous Eisenhower-Benson farm policies. Realized income per farm in your State is up 57 percent.

The Goldwater line on agriculture echoes another illustrious leader of the Republican Party, Calvin Coolidge, who said “farmers never made much money, I doubt there is much we can do about it.”

Well, we Democrats do not believe that agriculture must be at the bottom of our booming economy. We believe the farmers—the farm families—of America should share in America’s prosperity and should not be relegated to last place at the table by a don’t know, don’t care Republican administration. While most of the things the Republican nominee says require many explanations, on rare occasions he is perfectly clear. He was absolutely right when he said, “I am not a farmer and I don’t know anything about farming.”

Over Goldwater’s futile opposition this administration working with a Democratic Congress enacted the area redevelopment program to help local people develop the industries which will be there tomorrow. Here in Arkansas through your work, your efforts, your initiative and with the Federal assistance available through ARA *you* have created 5,000 new jobs to add to the growing prosperity of Arkansas.

You can take special pride in your spokesmen in Washington. They have spoken and fought for you while Senator Goldwater has fought against you.

When your congressional delegation led by John McClellan was fighting—along with the late Bob Kerr of Oklahoma—to get the Arkansas River project off the ground, where was the Senator from Arizona? *Opposed.*

When earlier this year “Took” Gathings, Bill Fulbright, and others were working for a sound cotton program to insure the future of eastern Arkansas, where was the Senator from Arizona? *Opposed.*

When Wilbur Mills was working to develop the tax bill for the relief of Americans at all economic levels, where was the Senator from Arizona? *Opposed.*

When Bill Fulbright was fighting for Senate ratification of the Test Ban Treaty to take us a little farther away from nuclear disaster, where was the Senator from Arizona? *Opposed.*

When Wilbur Mills and Oren Harris were leading the fight for the Trade Expansion Act and when it was being fostered in the Senate, where was the Senator from Arizona? *Opposed.*

When the Congress of the United States was enacting legislation to provide much needed classrooms and libraries for our colleges and universities and legislation to strengthen and expand vocational educational courses in our public schools, and job training for unskilled and unemployed, where was the Senator from Arizona? *Opposed.*

76 HHF

And now we are asked by the Republicans to give this persistent naysayer our votes. Senator Goldwater whose program boils down properly to an exercise in futility.

We have a choice. It is between the Republican chaos of dissension and Democratic unity. It is between Republican retreat and Democratic progress. It is between the past and the future.

The gospel of fear and distrust must not prevail.

It is our task—yours and mine—in this election to see that it does not. It is our task to see that sound, wise, proven leadership remains in the White House. It is our task to unify America to meet the challenges of her future.

In this city almost a year ago the 35th President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, said:

This great new South contributes to a great new America, and you particularly, those of you who are young, I think, can look forward to a day when we shall have no South, no North, no East, no West, but one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. That is what we are building in this country today.

To this task we of the Democratic Party must devote our total energies in this election year. I pledge myself to this goal. I ask your help.

Little Rock, Ark.

Democratic State Convention, Robinson Auditorium
September 18, 1964

TRANSCRIPT OF ADDRESS OF SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY, DEMOCRATIC VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much. Thank you, thank you very much. [Applause.]

Thank you. Thank you very much, Chairman Wilbur Mills, Senator John McClellan, Senator William Fulbright, all of the members of this great delegation from the land of opportunity, the State of Arkansas—indeed, your chairman here today, Congressman Mills, and Congressman Harris, and that friend of the farmer, Congressman "Took" Gathings, and Jim Trimble, and each and every one of you responsible for this party.

My heartiest greetings to the Democrats who, throughout all of their years, have demonstrated that wisdom, and that prudence of judgment which commends the State of Arkansas to every thoughtful American, because Arkansas has never failed the Democratic party, and I want to compliment you on your good judgment. [Applause.]

Now, you folks have started me off in a manner here which is going to be rather difficult for me. You have given to Mrs. Humphrey a beautiful bouquet of roses, a lovely corsage, and this lady is apt to be getting used to these things, and I have told her that this just doesn't happen, particularly that she shouldn't expect them as a regular diet, but now that you have started it, we will come back to Arkansas as many times as you will let us. [Applause.]

We will always be so appreciative and grateful of your warm, generous hospitality.

We had a wonderful morning in Hot Springs—beautiful city. I can see why the political leaders of Arkansas are always so vigorous. I can see why they are always so effective.

My gracious, if we had had Hot Springs in Minnesota, I would never have known what defeat ever was. [Applause.]

I really can't sympathize with John McClellan and Bill Fulbright any more when they come back to me and tell me about the hard work they go through in these statewide campaigns. I have always wondered why these two Senators looked healthier than any other two Members of the U.S. Senate. [Applause.]

And I found out today. I have found out that they spend a reasonable amount of time out on the hustings in the 75 counties of this great State, and an unreasonable amount of time down at Hot Springs just getting rejuvenated. [Applause.]

I have a confession to make. I hope that John McClellan will listen to me now in this.

77 HHF

John, I have caused you a lot of trouble during my 15½ years in the U.S. Senate. I have served in John McClellan's committee under his chairmanship almost every day of my period of service in the U.S. Senate, and I have never known a man that was more patient, more forbearing.

John, I'm going to do you a big favor now. I know the trouble I've caused you. I know the worry that you have had. I know the patience you have exercised, and now you've got the chance of a lifetime. If you will elect Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, he'll take me with him to the Vice-Presidency and I won't bother you on the committee any more. [Applause.]

And I look back, and I see Senator Fulbright smiling and laughing out loud and saying, "Oh, twice blessed. Hubert won't even be on my committee any more."

Well, we Minnesotans have served under good leadership. My distinguished colleague in the U.S. Senate, Senator Eugene McCarthy, was one of the most faithful and one of the most effective members of the House Committee on Ways and Means under the chairmanship of one of the greatest men of the U.S. Congress, Wilbur Mills. [Applause.]

And I know that the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Orville Freeman, who has been in this State many times, would want me to convey his greetings to you because you folks have been so gracious, so considerate, to all of us.

Well, I've got a lot of things I want to talk to you about. I want to talk about how we Democrats are doing things and I want to talk about how those Republicans will do things to us if we just let them. So, if you'll just lean back, we're going to get acquainted.

I remember what Sam Rayburn said. Sam Rayburn said, "I'm a Democrat, without any prefix or any suffix, and without any apology." And that's what Hubert Humphrey is, just a Democrat. [Applause.]

This great convention, to which I was invited by your distinguished Governor—and by the way, I want to thank the Governor for his invitation. I am most grateful. [Applause.]

This great convention is meeting in an auditorium that is named after one of Arkansas' greatest Democrats, and most distinguished public servants, Senator Joe Robinson, the able, courageous, late Senate majority leader during the administration of Franklin Roosevelt. [Applause.]

I think the first majority leader that I ever remember was Senator Joe Robinson. I was but a visitor in the gallery, but then as now, the voice of Arkansas, the leadership of Arkansas, was important to the welfare of the Nation and important to the welfare of the Democratic Party. We are indebted to you. [Applause.]

And when this great Nation of ours was floundering after 12 years of Harding and Coolidge and Hoover, and Republican normalcy—you know, these Republicans have got a car that has four shifts, all in reverse. It just depends upon which speed you want to take. [Applause.]

After those 12 years of returning to normalcy, Franklin Roosevelt called upon your Joe Robinson to help him rescue this Nation from economic and social disaster, and this former schoolteacher, country lawyer, Congressman, Governor, and Senator became the New Deal's old reliable in the U.S. Senate.

He died in the harness, fighting for the Democratic Party, just exactly as that great man from Kentucky—such a wonderful Democrat—Alben Barkley, died in the harness fighting for democracy. [Applause.]

But your Joe Robinson was followed in the Congress by one of the greatest delegations that I've ever heard of, or that represents any State. I know you might suspect this praise but when it's deserved, it ought to be said clearly and unmistakably.

John McClellan and Bill Fulbright, Chairmen of the Government Operations Committee and Foreign Relations Committee [applause] I say to you that these are two of the most respected, the most able, the most distinguished U.S. Senators who have ever served in the Congress of the United States. [Applause.]

78 HHF

The chairman of this convention and to whom I have already referred, Wilbur Mills. Wilbur Mills has more to say about what goes on in that Congress than almost any man I know of, save possibly the speaker and the majority leader, and he has more to say about tax legislation than any other man in the Congress—in fact, than in the United States, and I wish Barry Goldwater would remember that as he talks around the country. [Applause.]

My friend, Jim Trimble, is an able, very able, and effective member of the important House Rules Committee, and he works unstintingly on behalf of his district. In fact, Jim, the way it looks you've been backing up a truck to the Treasury. I want to compliment you on what you do for your district. [Applause.]

And then there is Oren Harris, with whom I spent a very pleasant morning today. Oren Harris, chairman of an important committee. He's made an immense contribution to the Nation and to Arkansas as the Chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; and no Member of the Congress knows better or champions more faithfully the interests of one of the great agricultural products of this State and one of the great industrial areas—no Member champions more faithfully the cotton industry than "Took" Gathings—what a man, "Took" Gathings. [Applause.]

In fact, if you even mention any other fiber than cotton, "Took" gets kind of angry with you.

The late President Kennedy, speaking here in your State [applause] yes, that late and beloved man was absolutely right when he said last October, just a month before that tragic day, and here's what he said: "Pound for pound, Arkansas has the most influential delegation in Congress." [Applause.]

Now, let me say a word about your Governor. I have already thanked him for the invitation, and I regret that he is indisposed today, and I want you to convey to him, the Governor and his wife, the greetings of Mrs. Humphrey and myself.

We Democrats, you know—we're a tumultuous and sometimes a bit of a noisy lot, and I guess it's no secret to you and surely not to many others that, on occasion, Governor Faubus and I may have had a difference or two in the past, but Mr. Dooley—yes, that's right—Mr. Dooley, who is the philosopher of the Democrats, so to speak, once said of his friend, Hennessey—he saw his friend Hennessey shining up a set of brass knuckles—and Dooley said to Hennessey, "Hennessey, where are you going?" And Hennessey replied, "To a Democratic unity meeting." [Applause.]

Hennessey said, "I always go well prepared." Well, I'm pleased to know that this year, no one has to take any brass knuckles to a Democratic unity meeting.

Confronted by the absurdities and the reckless attitude toward national interests of the Goldwater faction of the Republican Party, we Democrats stand united as never before. [Applause.]

So that I want to say to your Governor and to your delegation, to your Governor my congratulations for your program of economic progress in this great State of opportunity and for your constant effort to improve the welfare and the economic lot of the farmers of this great State and the rural areas of your State; for these, above all others, he deserves immeasurable credit. [Applause.]

Now, let's talk about our party for a moment. It's kind of difficult to talk about the other one because you're not sure which one you're talking about, the Eisenhower Republicans or the Goldwater ones, but right now, I guess we'll have to take that little faction over here that seems to be temporarily in charge.

Could there possibly be a greater contrast than the one that confronts us in 1964 between the bitter, angry pessimism of the Goldwater faction and the joyous enthusiasm and hope of the Democrats? For between the reckless impetuosity of Senator Goldwater and the responsible patient statesmanship of Lyndon Baines Johnson, the Democratic Party of 1964, is the political instrument for the aspiration of all the American people.

It is the party of the North and of the South. It is the party of the East and of the West. [Applause.]

79 HHF

It is, in the words of our President Lyndon Johnson, as he said at Atlantic City, and those words are more meaningful today than ever before, "It is the all-American party for all Americans that believe in progress." [Applause.]

Thomas Jefferson—great Democrat—one that we revere, once said, and I quote him:

Men by their constitutions are naturally divided into two parties; those who fear and distrust the people, and wish to draw all powers from them into the hands of the higher classes; and those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish and consider them as honest and safe.

Oh, what a prophet that man Jefferson was. He knew a Republican when he saw one, and he knew a Democrat, too, and it has been the salvation of the Democratic Party, and of this Nation that we have drawn our strength from the people, and that our policies of government manifest our concern for the people, and that our party refuses to betray its confidence and faith in the people. That's the record of the party to which we belong. [Applause.]

Now, our opponents in this election are hoping to win this election by cynically setting out to divide America, to set the North against the South, or the South against the North, the East against the West, the city against the farm, the rich against the poor, yes, even the young against the old, and the black against the white.

But what America needs is not division. What America needs is understanding, that needs tolerance. What a strong America needs is unity, and not division. [Applause.]

And what a prosperous America needs is opportunity for all and not just for some, and what a just America needs is equal protection of the laws for every citizen.

Our President put it, I think, as simply and yet as profoundly as anyone. Here's what he said:

We must not lock ourselves in with our prejudices. We must be prepared to learn, to be able to change our minds, to demonstrate compassion and humility towards others of different faiths, different origins, different sections, and different professions.

Those are the words [applause] those are the words of a man that loves America, that looks upon America as one great community of united people. He doesn't seek to divide; he seeks to bind us together into a mighty force for a mighty purpose. [Applause.]

Now, we are not going to live in the past, with old hates and prejudices. We are living in the dynamic present, which will hopefully put an end to antiquated strife. Our basic pledge now and in the future, as it has been in the past, our basic pledge is to provide responsibility in government and opportunity for every American. That's our commitment to this Nation. [Applause.]

I have been listening to these rather sharp and shrill voices attacking our Government, attacking our system, spreading doubt as to our Nation, even casting doubt upon our military might and our purpose. Well, let me say this, that American government is more than Washington. American government is Washington, the state capitol, the courthouse, the city hall, and the village hall. This great system of government doesn't work by having people tear it apart.

It works through cooperation and partnership; government and the people are partners in the cause of securing here in this land of ours the national interests. We are not mutual antagonists choosing up sides, contending against one another for power and glory.

Without bothering to wrap this all up in any fanciful, political theory, let me put it this way. We Americans have achieved, through our own design, a sound and a workable Federal governmental system, and this is truly then a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people." That is our Government. [Applause.]

I have heard how we have been losing our freedom and may I say that I don't think this is the way that you combat the Communist attack upon this Nation, by telling the whole world from every platform that in America people are losing their freedom. I think that freedom is greater in America today than ever before.

80 HHF

There is more freedom for a child who can go to school than one that can't. There are more opportunities in America today, not fewer, and America is stronger, not weaker, than ever before.

America is better, not poorer. America is richer, and mightier, than ever before, and as long as I am permitted to carry the message of my party, I am going to speak about the America that is the one that I love, the one that I work for and I am not going to spread doubt and suspicion about our form of government or our achievements. [Applause.]

So I say again, we are freer, we are stronger, we are richer, we are mightier, we are better. People know this, despite what Senator Goldwater says, and you may remember his words, "You know it in your hearts," and so does he, and you know that a government that cares for the unfortunate and the afflicted is a government that deserves your respect, and you know those of us that worship in our cathedrals, our churches, and in our synagogues, you know that compassion is not weakness and that concern for the unfortunate is not socialism.

You know that it is decency and that it is the best of Americanism. [Applause.]

The people of this State, like my State, have every reason to know that this partnership between our levels of government—Federal, National, and State—between government and the people has been a great instrument, not of oppression, not of tyranny, but of liberation, and that the National Government, far from being that engine of oppression, has aided the growth of the economic and political health of this very community where I now speak.

It's a curious thing, isn't it, that when a billion Federal dollars are appropriated for the central Arizona project, the Goldwater faction of the GOP shares this as a triumph of local initiative and Americanism. Yet, somehow, when the funds that are spent for the Arkansas River navigation project from Pine Bluff to Fort Smith, are an invasion of States' rights, a violation of the 10th amendment— [Applause.]

An effort to corrupt the people of this State and to turn them into pawns of the wicked Washington bureaucracy. Baloney. Bunk. And you know it. [Applause.]

Similarly, these Goldwaterites attack the poverty program, President Johnson's imaginative effort to make the United States truly a land of opportunity for all.

You know, I have heard so many times about that we need a choice. Well, you've got one. Lyndon Baines Johnson wages war on poverty. Senator Barry Goldwater wages war on progress.

That's the choice. [Applause.]

Yes, the Senator from Arizona attacks these programs, particularly this program on poverty, suggesting, I guess, that no one should be poor, since everyone has an equal opportunity to inherit a department store.

The issue in this campaign is whether the American people can join together, living and working together, for the common good. The alternative is the slippery slope of distrust, of hatred and of disaster, and I know of no surer way for the defeat of this republic in every area of the world and for everything for which it stands.

Our party says that it is not wrong to be concerned about adequate farm income in Arkansas, and about the urban problems in New York. Our party says that the development of the Arkansas water resources—as your Senator John McClellan and your Senator William Fulbright and your Congressmen said—is in the national interests.

Our party does not talk of dividing up the jobs among the unemployed but rather of building a growing, strong economy which can absorb all who want to work and all the talent of every American willing to do a job for this country. [Applause.]

And these aren't just words. The past 4 years have been years of solid achievement. The Federal Government has been at work. John Kennedy asked this Nation to get moving again. He called upon us to make some beginnings. He asked us to bestir ourselves and become once again the bright hope of the world, and the Federal Government has a role to play in this, not the whole role, but a part of it. And the Federal Government has invested in Arkansas, not

81 HHF

only for the sake of Arkansas. It's invested in Minnesota, not only for the sake of Minnesota. It has invested because investment in Arkansas or in my State is an investment in America's future.

All of America must prosper together or Americans will not prosper at all. It's just that simple. [Applause.]

Now, when you hear these voices that tell you that we should do less and that this terrible thing that befalls the Federal Government should be withdrawn from the picture, remember this. Federal dollars are being invested in Arkansas in the form of roads and airports and libraries, college dormitories, dams, and other facilities.

Federal agriculture programs, Mr. Farmer, help farmers improve their lands, produce more and get a better price for their crops. Small business and area redevelopment loans have helped create new industries and expand old ones. Vocational education, public welfare veterans' benefits, school lunches, and many other programs contribute steadily to the improving of the standard of living in this State and every one of the other 50 States in this Union.

Only last week, as I have indicated earlier, Congress approved \$113 million for the Corps of Engineers projects in Arkansas—I should say, last month—for fiscal 1965, and in that \$113 million, there was an item of \$87.8 million to keep the Arkansas River program on schedule, thanks to the request of your delegation and of the President of the United States. [Applause.]

And listen to this figure, my friends, before you listen to what Mr. Goldwater tells you to do. In fiscal 1964, total Federal expenditures in this wonderful State—much of it for the defense of this Republic and we are grateful to you for what you do—Federal expenditures in this State last year were \$904 million. The extent to which the Federal Government is investing in your State can be readily understood when one considers that the total taxes collected was \$359 million.

But this is as it should be. Arkansas is making a great contribution to the common defense. This Nation is providing tremendous economic growth for this, a part of America. The most tangible and easily appreciated return on the investment which your Government has made in Arkansas over the years is the increase in personal income that has accompanied the expansion and diversification of industry in this State.

In 1940, per capita income in Arkansas was only \$256, 43 percent of the national average. In 1964, only after 2 years of the help of a friendly administration, per capita income had reached \$1,598, or better than 65 percent of the national average, and your present rate of growth is the fastest in the Nation. I salute you. [Applause.]

This is what we mean by partnership, what has happened between Washington and your State, between your congressional delegation and your Governor. It is good policy, sound economics, good government.

One of your Senators said in a report to one of his constituents, "This is not charity. It is sound investment."

A healthy, prosperous Arkansas makes a greater contribution to a healthy, prosperous America, and I want more of it, not less, and President Johnson wants more for Arkansas, more for your elderly, more for your youth, more for your industry, more for your agriculture, more for the State, not less, and America will be the richer for it. [Applause.]

We have developed quite a legislative program these years of the Kennedy-Johnson administration. We have had some opposition, most of it futile, thank goodness. A Republican nominee who advocates—and may I ask every farm producer of Arkansas to listen to this—he advocates "the prompt and final termination of the farm price support program." Oh, yes, that'll be the day when Hoover and Coolidge disaster overtakes us once again.

And I don't intend to let it happen. That's why I'm out here on this platform. I want to remind you here, as I did farmers at Hot Springs this morning, don't take these things for granted. You can lose them. This man could win, and if he does win, you can kiss these programs goodbye.

82 HHF

We have enacted legislation to stimulate that farm income. Arkansas farm income is up 21 percent over the last disastrous days of the Eisenhower-Benson farm policies. Realized farm income in this State, according to your own records, are up 57 percent, since President Kennedy and President Johnson took the helm of Government and extended a helpful hand from the friendly, Federal Government working with your delegation to make Arkansas a better place.

The Goldwater line on agriculture echoes that illustrious leader of the Republican Party, Calvin Coolidge, who said, "Farmers never made much money. I doubt there is very much we can do about it." What a philosophy.

Well, we Democrats do not believe that agriculture must be at the bottom of our booming economy. We believe the farmers, and farm families, of America can and should share in this prosperity and should not be relegated to the last place at the table by a "don't know and don't care" Republican administration.

While most of these things that the Republican nominee says require many explanations, on rare occasions he is very, very clear. He was absolutely right when he said only recently, "I am not a farmer and I don't know anything about farming." I agree, Mr. Goldwater; you have said it. [Applause.]

Over the Arizona Senator's futile opposition, this administration went on to enact the area redevelopment to promote local people, local industry, for a better tomorrow, and this program within itself is resulting in your State in 5,000 new jobs for Arkansas people who wanted to work and didn't have a job.

You can take pride in your spokesmen in Washington. They have spoken and fought for you while the Republican pretender to the Presidency has fought against you.

When your congressional delegation, led by John McClellan, was fighting along with the late Bob Kerr, of Oklahoma, to get that Arkansas River project off the ground, where was the Senator from Arizona, that comes here and wants your help. He was opposed; not only did he vote against it, he chastised you for even thinking about it.

When "Took" Gathings, Bill Fulbright, and others were working for a sound cotton program to assure the future of eastern Arkansas, where was the Senator from Arizona? He was opposed.

When Wilbur Mills, after better than 1 year of study and hearings was attempting to develop a tax program that would reduce our taxes, stimulate our economy, give American business the money to invest, to help release the dynamics of a free enterprise system which would develop the tax bill for the relief of Americans at all economic levels, where was Senator Goldwater? Goldwater was opposed to it.

That's the kind of Republican ticket we would get, and now he comes out and says, "Let's reduce taxes by 25 percent."

Well, you don't reduce taxes on the road in the cabin of a jet. You reduce them by votes in the Congress of the United States.

What Barry Goldwater should have been doing was listening to Wilbur Mills, and what Barry Goldwater should have been doing was listening to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. What he should have been doing was having some faith in the free enterprise system of this Government, giving our business people courage to increase it, to move ahead, instead. "No, no, a thousand times, no."

But now a new tax program, bigger than ever before, he is safe in advocating because he will never have a chance to do anything about it.

Then when Bill Fulbright was fighting for the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty to take us a little farther from nuclear disaster, where was the Senator from Arizona? Opposed.

Now, he advocates, contrary to this, to establish as the policy of this Government, that the President of the United States should not maintain control of the nuclear weapon. Oh, no, but those little tiny nuclear weapons were of such magnitude as destroyed Hiroshima, they should be given to the field commanders on the front. This is what worries me.

This is why Republicans by the thousands are turning to Lyndon Johnson. They are turning to Lyndon Johnson because he is a man with prudent judgment. He is a man that you can trust, and they are

83 HHF

not about ready to put the fate of this land into the impulsive, untested, nervous hands of the Senator from Arizona.

Now, my friends, just one more. When Wilbur Mills and Oren Harris were fighting for the Trade Expansion Act that helps this State, that promotes the export of cotton, that promotes the export of soy beans, that promotes the export of your industries, and when that bill was receiving overwhelming support of Republicans and Democrats alike in the Congress, where was the Senator from Arizona? In his traditional dark closet, voting no. [Applause.]

Now, when the Congress of the United States was enacting legislation providing for much needed classroom and libraries for our colleges and universities, and legislation to strengthen vocational education for your children in our public schools, legislation for our medical schools for nursing training, job training for the unskilled and unemployed, where was this temporary spokesman of the Republican Party? He was where he ordinarily is. He was locked up in the darkroom of negative opposition. He was opposed.

Is this the way to help Arkansas? Is this the way to help America? America's youth deserves the best of education. Our colleges are today needing more classrooms and more teachers, more libraries, more scientists.

If we are to be the leading Nation of the world and the defense of this republic, rescue the brainpower that youth training can develop, the future of this world rests in that brainpower.

Let me say for the record. No one needs to fear Federal instruction. The great land-grant colleges of America, that have been the backbone of our industries, were federally endowed. It has helped make America the strongest Nation in the world, but in that, they would never have received Senator Goldwater's vote. He would have voted no.

Now, you are asked—and he is going to make his big play, I think, in the South because here he thinks he can divide us—he thinks he can play on old sores—this man comes to you to give support. You are asked to give this Republican pretender to the Presidency your vote.

Ask him how many votes he ever gave you and give him just as many, and that will mean none.

Yes, sir; we have a choice. It is between action and inaction, between paralysis and vitality. It is a choice between two men, say, from the West or from the Southwest, one of the 19th century, and one of the 20th century, and I suggest we all take a look at the calendar.

Of course, I am not intrigued because this man from Arizona seems to have such a good time, more or less, just revising his remarks. [Applause.]

As a student he has a calendar with no years, as an observer of the contemporary scene, he has a watch with no hands, and as one who seeks to give America leadership with vision, he has glasses with no lenses.

May I suggest that you'd be better off to have a schoolteacher who ----- to share the burden, who carries a watch and knows the time of day, and wears glasses with lenses and has vision, and that will be Lyndon B. Johnson. [Applause.]

It is our task, therefore, fellow Democrats, regardless of what differences we may have, to unite, stand together, learn to count on one another, adjust our problems, and face the common adversary.

It is our task to see that the sound, wise, and proven leadership that you have had in these last 9 months under Lyndon Johnson remains in the White House for 4 more years.

It is our task to unite and unify this country to meet the challenge this year at home, and to meet the enemy abroad, and in this city almost a year ago, the 35th President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, said these words—and I know of no better way to conclude a message to Democrats than by reciting these prophetic and these meaningful words of faith and substance given to us by a vital, intelligent, courageous, fine, young man that became our President.

84 HHF

Here is what he said: "This great new South contributes to a great new America, and you particularly, those of you who are young, I think can look forward to a day when we shall have no South, no North, no East, no West, but one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. That is what we are building in this country today." So said John F. Kennedy to the people of America.

And to this task, we of the Democratic Party have an obligation, now as never before, to devote our total energies in this election year.

I pledge myself to that goal. I pledge myself to help finish the unfinished task. I pledge myself to continue from the beginning we have made. I pledge myself wholeheartedly, enthusiastically, to stand alongside one of the giants of our time, the President of the United States, and I ask you to give our President—a man who needs you—I ask you to give to the President and to your America, to give your hearts, to give your hands, to give your faith, and to give your work, and to give your dedication, now and in these weeks ahead, to help the Democratic Party and the cause for which it stands.

Thank you very much.

Houston, Tex.
Rice Hotel
September 19, 1964

TRANSCRIPT OF PRESS CONFERENCE OF SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY, DEMOCRATIC VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much.

I am not at all sure just how you wish to conduct these proceedings, but I gather that we are maybe underway and I am surely very pleased and happy and honored to be in Houston, Tex.

I have been greeted by your esteemed and very able Governor and now, I make myself available for whatever treatment that you may feel you'd like to accord a friendly visitor.

QUESTION. Senator, one question I'd like to have answered here in Houston—it's been answered before—were you one of the founders of ADA, and do you still believe in this.

Senator HUMPHREY. I was one of the founders of the ADA, and it has and does perform a very valuable service. It was organized for the special purpose of combating leftwing communism infiltrating into liberal movements, including trade unions as well as political parties; was a very valuable instrument in the State of Minnesota, where the record is beyond any shadow of a doubt that it's part of the cooperative effort of a number of groups.

The ADA—we were able to rid a part of any traces of leftwing, radical communism infiltration. If you don't mind just a boastful statement, I led the fight and there isn't anybody in mind—even a Goldwaterite—that would say that Senator Humphrey didn't successfully lead that fight and clean up a party so that I can only say that I am pleased in that cooperation and assistance, and I have maintained membership in the organization because I felt it acted as an independent instrument in American public life, dedicated to freedom.

It permitted a sounding board for intellectual life in American politics. It was wholesome and decent. I did not always find myself in agreement. I am a U.S. Senator and I am a Democrat, just like Sam Rayburn said "without prefix, without suffix, and without apology." [Applause.]

QUESTION. Sir, I am kind of interested in agriculture. I notice that the platform is not quite as specific this year on the Democratic farm approach. I wonder—does this reflect a change in attitude, and I also would like to know how you plan to favor your agriculture c

Senator HUMPHREY. In reference to the first part of your question, the platform, I believe, is brief on all items. It was the view of those of us that were keenly interested in the welfare of the Democratic party that the platform to be read, to be a useful instrument in a political campaign, should have brevity and conciseness; that platform does pledge the Democratic Party to a continuing effort to obtain parity of income for American agriculture.

85 HHF

It is a fact that American agriculture today does not fully share in the overall general prosperity of the American economy. It shares better now than it did 4 years ago but it does not share as well as it should.

I have proposed—because I do believe that many of our agricultural policies do need careful reexamination in light of the changes in agriculture, technological scientific products, changes I have proposed—the establishment of a national commission on agricultural policy to examine into the present programs, to carefully examine into all proposals and alternatives, to examine into the relationship of our domestic supply and domestic production, as it relates to our exports in commercial markets, our food-for-peace program, which is a part of our foreign policy, and national strategic reserves, which I believe are necessary for the well-being of our country in rather uncertain and troublesome times.

The best way that I can prove my answer is to say that we stand on the record of our party. It is not a record of perfection but it is a record that I consider superior to that that is presented by the opposition.

QUESTION. Senator, what do you think so far of your southern exposure?

Senator HUMPHREY. It's been warm. I have a nice sunburn.

I think it's been wonderful, and may I say that I have been intrigued by the interest shown in this. You know I consider myself to be a citizen of the United States, and I like the South, just like I like the North.

Again, I happen to feel that what is needed in this country is more people that talk about our country and less people that talk about our sections. We need people that understand that policies of our government are directed toward the total national welfare and national prosperity.

I have been graciously and warmly received, primarily, I suppose, because Mrs. Humphrey was with me, and so many of your distinguished members of the press—in every place we have been—there have been no incidents of bad manners and I have not expected any of such incidents.

Southern hospitality is a reality and the receptions have been grand and I have a feeling that the South will go for Lyndon B. Johnson, just like the North, the East, and the West.

QUESTION. Senator, if you are elected Vice President of the United States and there should come up a tie vote where you would have to cast the deciding vote on whether or not the oil depletion allowance should be reduced, would you vote for reducing it or would you vote to kill the bill?

Senator HUMPHREY. I would vote as the President of the United States established the policy of this country. I am the President's running mate and a Vice President is supposed to be loyal to his President. He is supposed to carry out the policies of his President, if he is given that opportunity. He is supposed to be a faithful servant and ally to the President, and I shall support the policy of the President of the United States. [Applause.]

QUESTION. Senator, there are reports circulating in Washington that there already is a certain contingency plan under which field commanders could activate nuclear weapons, which would be a very dire circumstance.

Could you tell us whether that jibes with your knowledge, and if so—and I might add that these reports are supposedly authoritative—whether you think this would not be under the so-called “finger on the trigger” issue?

Senator HUMPHREY. I know of no such reports. I have no such information. I believe that I am about as close to the full information relating to our national security policies as any other Senator.

The Republican nominee of the Republican Party, who is entitled to all information, I regret to say that he hasn't accepted that invitation on the part of the President. If he would accept the invitation and the offer, as did other nominees of other days, he might be a little more accurate in his statements, and he might be able to give a little greater sense of balance and responsible utterance to his comments.

86 HHF

I feel that the matter of nuclear policy, the President's control over the nuclear weapons, is of the utmost importance in this campaign. It really ought not to have been made an issue, but it was by Mr. Goldwater.

We have had a constant policy relating to this since the time of the McMahon Act, since the time of the first explosion of the atomic bomb. No Republican that I know of, nor any Democrat, up to now, has suggested that that policy be changed.

Mr. Goldwater has made the suggestion. I think it is a reckless suggestion. I think it is irresponsible and I am going to place my trust in the present policy and in the President of the United States. [Applause.]

QUESTION. Senator, there have been reports from Washington that Secretary of State Rusk twice wrote to Senator Goldwater, proposing that he be briefed on security matters, and the Senator didn't even deign to reply. Can you confirm that?

Senator HUMPHREY. I cannot confirm the details of the report, but I can confirm that the nominee of the Republican Party has been offered, as have Mr. Nixon and Mr. Kennedy in 1960, full access to all security information so that their campaigns might be conducted within the knowledge of that whole information.

He has been offered, but he has not accepted that invitation. I think it is a mistake that he has not.

QUESTION. Senator, to follow up on the question of whether there has been some advance planning involving the use of nuclear weapons, can you categorically state to us that under no circumstances can a NATO commander use a nuclear weapon without first getting the prior approval of the President?

Senator HUMPHREY. Insofar as my knowledge of it is concerned, sir. I can only speak for myself, and, gentlemen, may I say that since you're both from the Washington press corps, the place to ask that question is of the President of the United States.

QUESTION. Senator, what, at this moment or at this time, are your personal views on—this is a three-pronged question—

Senator HUMPHREY. All right, take them one at a time.

QUESTION. All right, sir. What are your personal views on crude and product inputs?

Senator HUMPHREY. You're speaking of the oil imports?

QUESTION. Yes, sir.

Senator HUMPHREY. We have, as you know, a voluntary quota. It is my view that since that quota system was imposed some years ago, that it may very well require restudy. I do believe, however, that we cannot close out those imports, but to make it very simple and direct, I believe that we must maintain, through policies of Government, Federal and State, a healthy domestic oil industry and I am prepared, as one member of this administration—if permitted to be a member of that administration—to work toward that kind of a policy.

And I would add that I think the President of the United States, who has demonstrated a great knowledge of the oil industry, and surely has a sympathetic appreciation of its importance, would be able to do about as good a job in this area as any, and I shall support the President's program. [Applause.]

Shall we get to the second?

QUESTION. No. 2, your personal views at this moment on decontrol of natural gas resources?

Senator HUMPHREY. I support the present policy, sir, that we presently have. Now, may I say once again that if that policy is to be changed, it will be fought out inside the administration. I am not running for the Senate or a senatorship from Minnesota, but you have asked me a very frank question. I like to be very honest with you.

I would state my point of view within the councils of this administration, and once the decision has been made, I am a team player. I didn't accept the nomination of Vice President to betray the President. I accepted it to help him, and that I will do.

QUESTION. Senator, this is a three-part question.

Senator HUMPHREY. By the way, did you complete your question?

QUESTION. The third one was your personal views at this moment on the depletion provision, which is differentiated from this gentleman's question.

HHF 87

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, we have had some questions on that matter. I think I even saw that somebody had more or less improved the private enterprise structure in advertising here in Houston by placing a little ad in the paper on this matter.

I would only add this, that I had voted in the past to cut back on depletion allowances. I have never voted to remove them. I have voted for what we call a graduated scale. It is my view that this matter will be carefully examined by the administration, as it was by President Kennedy.

When I voted for those depletion allowances, I might add, most of the amendments were offered by Republicans, some of the strongest Goldwater supporters today, like Senator Williams, of Delaware.

I have a feeling that, as a Senator from Minnesota, where the depletion allowance for iron ore was 15 percent, that I wasn't in exactly the most happy position voting for 27½ percent for someplace else, but when the President presents his program to Congress, may I add, the Senator from Minnesota, who hopes at that time to be the Vice President, will carry out the advice and counsel and the instructions of the President, and you may very well find me to be a very friendly Texan.

QUESTION. Congressman Miller recently had quite a few choice comments in reference to immigration legislation that was proposed.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes.

QUESTION. What is your comment relative to his viewpoint that he made a few days ago?

Senator HUMPHREY. He made that comment, as I recall it, at Gary, Ind., or South Bend, Ind.—one of the places in Indiana—about 10 days ago. I was surprised, first of all, at his comments because he indicated it would represent a three-fold—as I recall his words—increase in the number of immigrants to the United States. That, of course, is not true.

What the immigration bill before the Congress provides is a pooling of unused quotas. It provides that entrance into the United States shall not be on the basis of your ethnic origin but on the basis, rather, of whether or not you have something to contribute to the United States.

The maximum number is not 450,000 but approximately 175,000, which is about 15,000 more than the present law provides for. It would also provide for family reunification. It would provide that if there were need for specialists and technicians and professional persons that could be helpful to the American economy, that the old quotas that might have denied somebody from Italy getting in because the quota is used up or somebody from Greece to get in because the quota is used up, that those quotas would be set aside and the pooling of unused quotas could be used for the Italian and for the Greek.

Now, may I say that if Mr. Miller's policy on immigration were the law of the land at the time that Barry Goldwater's grandfather came here, he'd never have been in Arizona. [Applause.]

So I reject Mr. Miller's policy. I support the Kennedy-Johnson proposals on immigration, advanced by President Kennedy when he was a Senator. I was a cosponsor with him of that proposal and I now support Lyndon B. Johnson's immigration proposal, which is before the appropriate committees of Congress.

QUESTION. Is that the bill that I read of that Senator Williams was supposed to have a hand in? There was a bill that was supposed to have been introduced by Senator Williams.

Senator HUMPHREY. Of New Jersey?

QUESTION. Yes, that's the one.

Senator HUMPHREY. It's the Hart bill, as I recall. Senator Williams may be a cosponsor, but Senator Philip Hart of Michigan, is the main sponsor in the Senate and I believe Mr. Celler, if I'm not mistaken, is the main sponsor in the House.

QUESTION. That's the bill that you are referring to.

Senator HUMPHREY. I believe that is correct, sir.

QUESTION. Now, there is one last question relative to that. There is a feeling at the present time, a lot of people who come over—specifically, I have in mind people coming over here on exchange visa—say, for students—you have a situation where they come over here and then after a few years, they have to go home.

Does this legislation that you speak of, does that provide for situations such as that?

Senator HUMPHREY. It does not. Those matters are handled specifically by special bills introduced into Congress, as I recall.

QUESTION. Could not the legislation be extended to include that?

Senator HUMPHREY. It surely could.

QUESTION. Because as it is right now, such legislation would be inequitable for those many that come, for example—

Senator HUMPHREY. That could be adjusted. That's the purpose of hearings.

QUESTION. What would you do to help this in that direction?

Senator HUMPHREY. I would be very helpless. I must say my mother was an immigrant. I have a very sympathetic feeling about it, and I think that she did quite well in this country.

QUESTION. Senator, as you toured the cattle grazing—

Senator HUMPHREY. Just a minute. Yes, sir.

QUESTION. Senator, do you think there would be more or less racial violence if Senator Goldwater were elected than there has been in the last several months?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I do not want to do Mr. Goldwater a disservice. I would hope that whoever is President of the United States would thoroughly understand that his duty and his moral and political obligation was to unite the country, to promote domestic tranquillity, to insure justice, and to provide for the common defense and to promote the general welfare. That's what the Constitution requires.

And I want to give Mr. Goldwater the benefit of the doubt. I might say that some of his comments during the campaign are not helping a bit to promote domestic tranquillity. I would hope that we would unite, and one thing I like about President Lyndon Johnson above all else—and I have always said this when he was Senator as well as President—he believes in a national consensus. He believes in a national unity. He was taught at the feet of Sam Rayburn, who thought this was but one country and said that he wanted to live in a country in which there was no North, no South, and no East and no West, and how well I remember Lyndon Johnson when he spoke up as a Member of the Senate, asking that we even eliminate from our thinking discrimination on the basis of section.

What we need from the spokesmen of both parties—and I know we have it from Mr. Johnson—is a plea to the American people that we be tolerant and understanding. To put it in somewhat Biblical terms, "To love one another," rather than to be so suspicious and rather than to divide and to tear apart.

I would hope that we could have a little more of that emphasis.

QUESTION. The polls indicate that the Democratic ticket at this point is farther ahead of the Republican ticket than at any other Presidential election in American history.

A. Do you believe the polls?

B. Do you think there is a danger of reversal, and if so, under what circumstances?

Senator HUMPHREY. Public opinion polls are never to be looked upon as being accurate. They are evaluations. They give you trends; they give you guidelines. They are used in merchandising as well as in politics. Businessmen use them; educators and we in politics. I think that the indicators are now—and the indications are—that the Johnson-Humphrey ticket is far ahead, but I would caution my fellow Democrats, as I did, and those who are friends of the President who are not Democrats, who are independents or are Republicans for Johnson—I caution them that you do not win elections on public opinion polls. You win them by hard work, by diligent effort, and you win them by getting to the election box some voting, and one of the worries that I have is that there are so many of our friends who are saying, "Oh, you're in. It's so wonderful. You've got it made."

89 HHF

Every time I hear that, I feel that the roads will be filled with anxious fishermen or hunters on election day, who ought to be going to the ballot box. They would take the day off for something else.

So I am going to ask everyone to forgo all of their hobbies, and all of their pleasures, on election day—unless they consider it a pleasure to be a good Democrat or a good independent or a Johnson Republican—and vote just once for Johnson and Humphrey on that day. [Laughter and applause.]

QUESTION. A question of importance in the Houston area. Do you think if Senator Goldwater is elected that he would curv the space program or balloon program or any of these things which are definitely vital to the NASA installation in the Houston area?

Senator HUMPHREY. I couldn't say that, but I can tell you this. If I lived in Houston, and if I had a President that was from the State of Texas, and whose best friend was the Governor of the State of Texas, I think I'd vote for the Texan. [Applause.]

QUESTION. Senator, as you toured the cattle-raising areas of the country, do you find support of the cattle raisers on the present beef import programs?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes; I think cattle raisers are much happier now. They had every reason to be unhappy some months ago, and we in the Congress, after careful examination of the problem, did legislate—I voted for that legislation. I did not vote for one that was pulled out of a hip pocket and offered on a bill one afternoon that would have killed the wheat bill and the cotton bill. I felt there wasn't any use of trying to lose both the cattle bill and the wheat bill and the cotton bill, so we voted a wheat bill and a cotton bill and gave the pledge that we would come back from committee with a reason, well-thought-out, carefully examined proposal, on meat imports. We did, and we presented it to the President. We strengthened the President's hand in this matter, and today, there are fewer imports of beef in the United States than there have been for years. Cattle prices are beginning to rise.

I might add, however, that we did not violate our treaty agreements. We did not violate our export development program, but we have been able to give the President that extra little power that he needs to be able to negotiate more effectively with exporting—beef exporting—nations.

Now, what else have we done? We have increased our own exports. Mr. Taylor, of this State, and others have been in on this program. We are beginning to look for some world markets. Our cattlemen have to face up to the fact that cattle population is substantially higher this year than it was a year ago. It was higher last year than the year before. And overproduction results in low prices, and it is to the eternal credit of the cattleman that he has not asked for price supports. He has not asked for any particular amount of Government help.

He has received large purchases by the Government. I think this is sound. The meat is being put to good use, and the cattle economy will be in a lot better hands when it's in the friendly hands of Lyndon Johnson, who recognizes that government has some responsibility, than one who says the Government ought to have nothing to do with these farm programs, and he says they ought to be terminated, namely, Mr. Goldwater.

QUESTION. Although Houston is the fifth largest city in the Nation, it's only been in the last 4 years that any municipal candidates have ever run under Democrat or Republican labels. Do you personally feel that in major municipal elections, the candidates should be identified under a national line?

Senator HUMPHREY. I think it's a little more honorable. May I say I've been in so-called nonpartisan elections, but most everybody knows where you stand? Also, party responsibility has something to be developed and to be encouraged, and if it gets out of hand, why, you develop a party machine that's corrupt—the people have a way of taking care of that. They are pretty good about these things. They know how to bounce you out if you haven't done your job.



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