



"The right to ... dramatize one's viewpoint -- including peaceful civil disobedience if one is willing to pay the price imposed by law ... must be an accepted and protected part of American life. And those who disagree must just learn to live with this indispensable right of a free people ... But I hope you will reject the effort to impose opinion by force."

- Senator Walter F. Mondale

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1968

SENATE

## MONDALE ASKS YOUTH FOR CRITICISM WITH AFFECTION

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] helped to welcome new students to the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis earlier this week. I believe his remarks are worth noting.

Senator MONDALE described a Nation of opportunity and despair, of power and impotence, of free criticism and irrational rage, of human rights and growing racism, of dedication to peace and immense waste in war, of compassion frustrated by rigidity and persecution.

He remarked on the growing gap between what we want and what we are willing to do, and our disappointing tendency to seek easy excuses for our failures.

Then Senator MONDALE spoke of the hope so many of us have that the bright, committed young people of today will help us to do better. Simply living a de-

cent and humane life is not enough, he told them; achieving political power is essential.

Senator MONDALE also spoke directly to the questions of protest and violence that are before us so much today. He said:

The right to demonstrate, protest, picket, and in other peaceful ways to dramatize one's viewpoint—including peaceful civil disobedience if one is willing to pay the price imposed by law—this right must be an accepted and protected part of American life. And those few law enforcement officers who disagree must just learn to live with this indispensable right of a free people. . . .

But there is another tactic I hope you will reject; that is, the effort to impose opinion by force. Some will tell you that violence will more quickly and effectively achieve your goals. They tell us that "democracy is in the streets"; meaning that issues must be settled by violent conflict. They would substitute the law of force for the force of law.

Those who resort to such tactics will not only lose personally but will greatly injure their cause. Undoubtedly the growing

YOUTH

strength of the right-wing repressive movement in this country is partly attributable to the violence we have seen.

For I do not believe that a society can be both free and violent. A free society must maintain itself in love and hope, not hate and fear.

Mr. President, Senator MONDALE's appropriate remarks deserve the attention of all Senators. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR WALTER F. MONDALE AT THE WELCOME WEEK CONVOCATION, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, MINN., SEPTEMBER 16, 1968

I am delighted to participate in Welcome Week, particularly since your theme is "When no one is aware." By now you know that you are welcome; let us pray that you are also aware.

We always begin speeches like this one by saying that youth has never been more needed; the only difference is that right now it is undeniably true. If there was ever a generation of American adults who should feel the need for the help of the young, it is ours.

What a strange, confused, disoriented, and in some ways embittered nation this is! Indeed, we may be on the verge of being two Nations, as one official report puts it: one white, one black; separate and unequal.

For most of us—for almost all of us in this auditorium this morning—this is a Nation of unprecedented wealth, employment, and opportunity. But for millions of other Americans this is another nation—impoverished, under and unemployed, poorly housed, ill and undernourished, and, perhaps worst of all crippled by frustration, despair, and rage.

We have produced a nation of unparalleled power, but we have proved our impotence in our cities and in Vietnam.

We have produced a nation whose devotion to liberty and justice and free criticism is both fundamental and historic, and yet we recently saw, as one analyst put it, "a sudden convulsion of irrational rage directed by some of us against others of us, a devastating tantrum of armed and uniformed adults against a youthful, helpless, and largely innocent rabble."

Our nation, proud of its commitment to human rights, reads public opinion polls which show one of our top racists building such a following for President that he could conceivably become a fundamental force in setting the future direction of this country.

While we declare our commitment to peace, more than 27,000 Americans have died in Vietnam and the cost of the war—now near \$30 billion annually—sharply diminishes our capacity to deal with our human problems here and abroad.

I believe we have tried for peace and sincerely want peace. But I do not believe we have been willing to take as great a risk to achieve a settlement as we once took to win the war through escalation.

We are a nation proud of our institutions—churches, schools, governments, and business, labor, and other cooperative organizations. But for all they have done, our institutions have still too often become, as one of our chief social critics puts it, an "enormous potential source of arbitrary impersonal power which folds, bends, spindles, and mutilates individuals but keeps IBM cards immaculate."

We are a nation proud of our compassion—the story of the good Samaritan is almost an American folk tale. But we have built and maintained a deeply entrenched welfare system that shatters pride and discourages effort. It provides so little help for so many that what should be their temporary need for assistance and hope has become a permanent dependence and despair.

Whether the acknowledged objectives be decent education, housing, nutrition, health, or employment, there is a growing gap between what we want done—what we favor, the dreams we endorse, the hopes we arouse—and what we are willing to do. The gulf between our goals and our willingness to spend to achieve them has created a political environment that enables a critic to claim: "The rhetoric of public men . . . abounds in big ideas with small price tags. Or big ideas with no price tags at all."

And, ominously, some are now intensifying the old attempt to portray the human problems of this nation as the result of one single, simple cause: the lazy attitude of the mythical man who is able, but unwilling, to work.

Since the problem is so simple, so is the proposed solution: more "law and order" (whatever that means); a change in attitude that is free because it requires only an act of will; a willingness by courts and police to get tough.

Despite our commitment to human improvement, we defend Khesanh and abandon Job Corps camps; we head for the moon while men cannot afford to commute to work.

We say we oppose violence, and yet we cannot pass legislation to reduce the toll of 18,000 lives a year lost by gunfire. In the past five years, the victims have included President Kennedy, Martin Luther King, and a young man who entered the freshman class of the Senate with me—Robert Kennedy, a man who truly did "dream of things that never were and wonder why not?"

If I sound disappointed, I am. If I sound discouraged, I am not.

I am not discouraged for many reasons, but none is more important than my faith in you and the other young people of this country.

Many of us hope we are correct when we say we believe you are different; that something new is afoot; something qualitatively different is occurring.

Your generation appears to us to be more idealistic, more human, more concerned with personal honesty and commitment than any previous generation.

The quality of personal relationships seems to concern you more than it did the activists of my campus days, or than it does those in my political environment today.

I sense in you a healthy reaction from the impersonality of the institutions facing you; I see a strong desire for a society which is humane.

If this observation is accurate, then I hope you never grow up. I hope instead that you are able to infect the rest of us with your kind of maturity.

Having said this, I must add that I see some disturbing tendencies among some of your generation—disturbing in that they are wasteful.

The first tendency is perhaps best illustrated by a long and frustrating conversation I had in Washington with one of our nation's most gifted student leaders. I was trying to discover what it was that caused him to believe that existing institutions, particularly government, could not be reformed.

Finally in despair I asked him what he thought I could do as a United States Senator to help. I'll never forget his answer. He said, "There isn't much you can do here."

I believe this comment reflects a belief that, first of all, it is impossible to reform



the system very much from the top, and second, that the fundamental problems of our society are those involving person-to-person relationships, which can only be dealt with at a level closer to the people.

The conclusion seems to be that politics at the center—particularly in Washington but also in the state capitols and city halls—isn't really that important or relevant to the major concerns of your generation.

One result of that conclusion appears to be that some of the brightest of your generation are "opting out" of the political process. Many young people organized brilliantly to change our national life in the area of civil rights. Many of you organized brilliantly to change our national policy in the area of foreign relations. And you have won.

But others now seem to be limiting their actions to the range of their perceptive selves.

What bothers me is the fear that the young may be threatening their high values with some lousy strategy.

Working out one's identity and trying to live as a decent human being is a crucial goal. But I believe that the political system is such that it cannot forever be ignored; it must be used, molded, wrenched, or even fought.

And if you don't make the effort to influence or capture political power at the center, then I just don't see how the plan of simply living a decent and human life will work.

You won't be able to climb a hilltop and enjoy the flowers—or even the grass—because we will have polluted the air and killed practically everything that grows.

You won't have a view from that hill, because we will have blocked it off with billboards.

And you won't be left in peace by a hungry world that we won't help feed.

And the process of dehumanization will continue as our institutions and our society pass entirely out of your control.

What I'm saying is this: I'm glad you are experimenting, both organizationally and personally, to solve problems in ways more imaginative than before and on many more levels than before. I am simply suggesting that these experiments should not be accompanied by rejection of the effective use of political power.

If you accept my suggestion that you are important to the political process, may I make a few closing observations about the tactics and attitudes I believe to be needed.

The right to demonstrate, protest, picket, and in other peaceful ways to dramatize one's viewpoint—including peaceful civil disobedience if one is willing to pay the price imposed by law—this right must be an accepted and protected part of American life. And those few law enforcement officers who disagree must just learn to live with this indispensable right of a free people. The objective here is to persuade, to make one's point of view more visible and dramatic.

But there is another tactic I hope you will reject; that is, the effort to impose opinion by force. Some will tell you that violence will more quickly and effectively achieve your goals. They tell us that "democracy is in the streets"; meaning that issues must be settled by violent conflict. They would substitute the law of force for the force of law.

Those who resort to such tactics will not only lose personally but will greatly injure their cause. Undoubtedly the growing strength of the right-wing repressive movement in this country is partly attributable to the violence we have seen.

For I do not believe that a society can be both free and violent. A free society must maintain itself in love and hope, not hate and fear.

Long ago William Butler Yeats described a declining society in phrases that should haunt us today:

"Things fly apart; the center cannot hold. The best lack all conviction, and the worst are filled with passionate intensity."

He was describing another time, and another kind of passionate intensity. But his words are a warning to us now.

Let us turn away from that kind of passion, and let me close with some final thoughts about this society. One of the exciting things about living now is that John Gardner, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, is living and writing, too. He must be one of America's great citizens.

In his commencement address this year at Cornell University, Gardner reported on his discovery of a system by which one could look three centuries ahead and evaluate the quality of life today by hindsight.

His 23rd century scholars discovered that in the last third of the 20th century "the rage to demolish" American institutions succeeded "beyond the fondest dreams" of the "dismantlers."

Following the destruction of our culture, "there followed less than a century of chaos and disorder," unlike the long dark years of the Middle Ages.

When society had rebuilt, a study was commenced to determine what caused the downfall of civilized society in our time. They asked: "Why did men turn on their institutions and destroy them in a fit of impatience?"

They found that our "demands for instant performance led to instant disillusionment, for while aspirations leapt ahead, human institutions remained sluggish—less sluggish to be sure, than at any previous time in history, but still inadequately responsive to human needs."

The 23rd Century scholars, looking back on us, made a very telling observation, Gardner reports.

"They pointed out that 20th Century institutions were caught in a savage crossfire between uncritical lovers and unloving critics. On the one side, those who loved their institutions tended to smother them in an embrace of death, loving their rigidities more than their promise, shielding them from life-giving criticism. On the other side, there arose a breed of critics without love, skilled in demolition but untutored in the arts by which human institutions are nurtured and strengthened and made to flourish.

"Between the two, the institutions perished."

And then the scholars concluded something which I would like to make my conclusion, too. I do so as one who has spent his entire adult life trying to reform our institutions; one who has been privileged to be your Attorney General and one of your Senators; one who believes with Gardner that our institutions desperately need reform and affection.

The scholars decided this:

"... where human institutions are concerned, love without criticism brings stagnation, and criticism without love brings destruction."

What we need are loving critics; persons "sufficiently serious to study their institutions, sufficiently dedicated to become expert in the art of modifying them."

The 23rd Century scholars discovered that in our time there were men who tried to "redesign their own society for continuous renewal."

But no one was listening. In words that fit the theme of Welcome Week, no one was aware.

May those 23rd century scholars learn instead that you here matched your idealism

with your learning at this great University and that you not only became aware but committed yourselves to a lifetime of service in the cause of "continuous renewal of human institutions."

May they learn that because of you both the advice of the uncritical lovers leading to stagnation and that of the unloving critics leading to destruction, was rejected, and that in this place at this time we developed a nation of loving critics who so reformed human institutions that freedom, hope, opportunity, and fulfillment became a reality for all of our people.

Or, finally, to come back once more to what it means to be aware in the 20th Century, let us work in all our ways—let us work together above all—so that all of us might be remembered "simply as (good and decent men), who saw wrong and tried to right it, saw suffering and tried to heal it, saw war and tried to stop it.

Welcome to the University of Minnesota.

## St. Thomas College Speech

This is a country of terrible contrasts:

opportunity and despair;  
power and impotence;  
free criticism and irrational rage;  
human rights and growing racism;  
dedication to peace, and immense waste in war;  
compassion frustrated by rigidity and persecution and hate.

Progress has never been more evident in science, space, and industry. But the unfinished agenda of social change also confronts our vision.

The Johnson years have accomplished much. Four hundred major pieces of legislation attest to the vision, wisdom, and unparalleled leadership of a President who accurately perceived the American dilemma.

The contrast between democratic and republican administrations is stark.

The Republican years brought the nation a sluggish economy, general unemployment, and a legacy of problems of poverty in cities and rural areas.

In contrast to the Republican years, Democratic administration has brought double the rise in average living standards and one-half the unemployment rate. Twelve million have been lifted from poverty, and 2.8 million from substandards to decent shelter.

Net farm income is up 24%, while it declined 17% during the Benson years.



Yet despite this strong record, despite the legislation, so much remains to be done. For the problems of poverty, discrimination, and isolation have yet really to be addressed.

A negro baby born today, regardless of section of the country or state has

$\frac{2}{5}$  the chance of living to his first birthday than a white baby born the same place the same day;

$\frac{1}{2}$  the chance of completing high school;

$\frac{1}{3}$  the chance of completing college;

$\frac{1}{3}$  the chance of becoming a professional;

Twice the chance of becoming unemployed;

$\frac{1}{4}$  the chance of earning \$10,000 per year;

Three times the chance of earning less than \$3,000;

A life expectancy five years less;

Prospects of earning only  $\frac{1}{2}$  as much;

And almost the certainty of living in overcrowded housing units 56% of which will fail to meet health and safety standards.

Negroes are less likely to finish public school, and more likely to attend schools with high dropout rates. 60% of tenth graders in poverty neighborhoods of our fifteen largest cities drop out before they finish high school.

As early as third grade, the average negro student is one year behind whites in verbal achievement. By the twelfth grade, the average negro student is three years behind.

Chicago's white neighborhoods have 10% more adults completing high school; a TB rate 1/9 that of non-white neighborhoods; an infant mortality rate half that of negro areas; and an incidence of substandard housing less than 2% the ghetto amount.

But the gap is not just between black and white. It is between rich and poor; urban and rural; old and young; minorities and majorities as well.

29 million Americans still live in poverty, and the numbers continue to grow.

Urban ghettos are much of the problem, but rural areas are important as well. One in five rural residents is poor; overall jobless rates in rural areas is 10%, and 20% are underemployed.

Four out of five Americans 65 years old and older lack jobs; while 13% of young Americans still are looking for work.

Unemployment rates in poverty areas are triple the national average; infant mortality rates are seven times as high.

More than 20 million Americans still live in inadequate housing...and the tale could continue on.

To those of you who say we are going to fast, I would say we are not going fast enough. The gaps between black, and white; rich and poor; minority and majority are too great. And to draw upon Langston Hughes, deferred dreams either dry up or explode.

The fact is that the social problems remaining to be ~~resolved~~ resolved are more complex and challenging than those we faced

before, because we have learned so much from the experiments of the last four years.

None of us can afford a "stop the world, I want to get off" attitude for that means the world we want will never be achieved.

"Our society must have the wisdom to reflect and the fortitude to act," said John Gardner.

We must reflect on our experience, and act in the realization of our future responsibilities.

To the poor who have done their part by stating their needs, we cannot now sell out.

We cannot say "wait" any longer, for they already have waited too long.

Party ideology is important; but so too are poverty problems.

We cannot afford sidewalk superintendents. We need people with the motivation and stamina to continue the ~~our~~ work of social reconstruction we have only begun.



# EXPENDITURE FACT SHEET

(1969 estimate)

## Government income comes, by the dollar

- 43¢ from individual income taxes
- 22¢ from social insurance and retirement
- 18¢ from corporate income taxes
- 9¢ from excise taxes
- 8¢ from other sources

## Government dollar is spent

- 43¢ for national defense of which 14¢ is for Vietnam
- 20¢ for social insurance and trust funds
- 11¢ for education and other major social programs
- 4¢ for veterans
- 3¢ for international affairs
- 19¢ for other activities

## This means that

We are spending almost fifteen times more defending ourselves against the world (defense expenditures and related matters) than we are building it (foreign and international affairs) more than

We are spending almost three times as much on defense as we are on education and other major social programs.

## Other facts:

Most of the major increases in budget outlays from 1968-1969 are in defense and related activities (\$4.9 billion).

Most of the major decreases in budget outlays were in domestic expenditures (\$1.3 billion for HUD).

1969 outlays for defense are \$79,789 million; 1969 outlays for the poor --\$27.7 billion. 1969 outlays for all health, labor, and welfare activities are estimated to be 27.6% of total budget outlays. Defense expenditures are estimated to be 42.9%.

We spent 2.8% of the total outlays (1969 estimate); 2.5% on space research and technology; 3.0% on agriculture; 2.5% on education; 1.5% on housing and community development; 1.3% on natural resources; and 3.9% on veteran benefits and services.

## QUOTE FROM HOWARD SAMUELS re both public and private expenditure contrasts:

"We spend as much for chewing gum as for model cities...as much for hair dye as for grants for urban mass transit...as much for pet food as for food stamps. We spend more on tobacco than government at all levels spends on higher education. We spend \$300 million for costume jewelry and quarrel over \$10 million for the Teacher Corps."

Who is responsible for the skewed priorities?

## EXPENDITURE FACT SHEET, Cont'd

While the major increases in the federal budget in recent years have been for defense, there have been responsible voices pointing out long lists of non-essential spending, where cuts could have been made. For example, Senator Clark detailed that 10.8 billion could be cut from the budget for defense without prejudicing national security: the ABM antiballistic missile system; the SAGE bomber defense system; surface to air missiles; manpower; tactical aircraft programs; anti-submarine carrier forces; attack carrier forces; amphibious forces fast deployment logistic ships (FDL's); manned orbiting laboratory.

But the problem is that, while the Senate stands for people as the top priority, the House seems to stand for defense.

The House members talk so much of economy. They speak of spending cuts and keeping expenditures under control. Their actions speak as loud as their words. They are for spending cuts all right--but in domestic programs helping people. When it comes to defense, their vision changes.

The fact is that, while the House consistently approves much smaller appropriations for domestic programs in health, education, welfare, housing, and community development, they approve more than the Senate in defense. (Example: this past session, the House approve a defense appropriation almost \$372 million more than the Senate.)

The problem also is related to the difference between authorization and appropriations.

The gap is relatively small between the two for defense matters. It is enormous, however, for our domestic programs.

For example: In the first session of this Congress, the gap between appropriations and authorization for military procurement and military construction was a small proportion indeed.

\$23.5 billion was authorized; 22.2 was appropriated, less than 1% less than the defense people had been authorized to get.

In that very same Congress, to take two domestic examples, the Food Stamp program was authorized for \$425 million;

while the appropriation was \$185 million; the mental health programs were authorized for \$238 million; but the appropriation was only \$45 million. For the Food Stamp program, this represented getting only a little less than half what had been authorized.

~~For~~ The mental health program got only about 1/6th what had been the intension of the Congressional authorizing committees.

It is also important to note the difference in the direction of the gap between appropriations and authorizations. While domestic programs feel the Congressional meat-axe chip away at their funds, defense programs may find their coffers enriched beyond requests.

For example: In the session of Congress just concluded weeks ago, military procurement was appropriated almost \$6 billion more than had been authorized.

At the same time, feeling the Brunt of that \$6 billion dollar expenditure reduction imposed by Wilbur Mills et. al., hospital construction programs lost \$22 million between authorization and appropriation, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs got only about one third in apporpriations what they had been authorized.



## SUBSIDIES AND PRIORITIES:

### MEMORANDUM

#### I. Definition of subsidy

An act by a governmental unit involving either (1) a payment; (2) a remission of charges, or (3) supplying commodities or services at less than cost or market price, with the intent of getting to market more goods at lower cost.

#### II. Types of Current Subsidy Programs

- A. Grants to business firms and corporations to carry out specific objectives: shipbuilding; producers of raw materials; railroad construction; mailcarrying; atomic fuel electricity generators
- B. Farm Subsidies: Commodity price support; surplus disposal programs; conservation and soil banks; International agreements
- C. Tax Benefits to Specific Economic Groups: Depletion allowances; accelerated amortization of defense facilities; concessions to certain small businesses; liberalized depreciation schedules; tax credits for plant and machinery modernization; deductions for certain groups--borrowers, including home mortgagors, the elderly, blind, and sick.
- D. Indirect Assistance to Specific Economic Groups: Financing of highway construction which results in subsidy to trucking industry; financing airport construction and air navigation aids; harbor improvement; protective tariffs; government purchase restrictions under the Buy American Act; cargo preference.
- E. Government Programs with Incidental Effects like Subsidies : Government Contracting; disposal of surplus property at less than market value; stockpiling of minerals and other strategic materials silver purchasing
- F. Free Government Services: Statistical services; weather and other research and service information; management and technical assistance to business, farm groups.
- G. Government Lending and Loan Guarantee Programs: to farmers, economically depressed areas; students; underdeveloped areas; commercial fisheries; housing and urban renewal facilities; certain types of poor people.
- H. Insurance programs: all of above plus welfare categories, veterans; financial institutions
- I. Grants in Aide to State and Local Government: Agriculture, Health, Education, Welfare, Defense, fish and wildlife, conservation activities.

### III. Expenditures for Subsidy programs:

In 1966, net Federal expenditures exceeded \$7 billion dollars.

Of that, \$4.7 went to agriculture

1.4 went to business

.6 went to labor

.15 went to homeowners and tenants

To these totals must be added the INDIRECT effect of these federal expenditures.

For example:

The oil import control program cost the federal government only \$284,000 to administer in fiscal 1969. BUT refiners and petroleum producers who receive free "tickets" to import oil at less than market price get a windfall of over \$350 million. Plus, the public has to spend several billion dollars more per year for petroleum products than if imports were permitted at lower prices.

The farm program costs the federal government \$4 billion already. But to this must be added the higher retail food prices for consumers that result.

The merchant ship subsidies cost about \$380 million per year. But to this must be added the added cost to the government of the program that requires about half of our exports financed under foreign aid grants be carried by these higher price ships.

### IV. Goals and Priorities in Subsidy Programs

The goal of subsidy programs in this United States should be to improve the status of groups of people or industries where the social payoff exceeds the social cost to other groups not so benefitted.

Too many of our programs fail to do this:

They benefit the already rich to highly at a time when we fail to provide adequate assistance to the poor:

The social costs to the disadvantaged exceed the benefits to the few helped.

Examples:

The vast majority of subsidy programs go to help the "military-industrial complex--oil interests; defense builders; ship; air; and railroad builders; exporters getting benefit of protective tariffs, and domestic markets who also benefit from such tariffs. Numerically, the number of programs helping those with lower incomes is vastly limited--homeowners; those with specific disabilities (age, blindness, certain kinds of illness, etc)

We spent, in 1966, 91 times as much on business aides and special services (mostly for air and sea navigation and maritime operating

subsidies) as we did for aides to homeowners and tenants (including public housing, slum clearance, and urban renewal and administrative expenses).

We spent more than twice as much on these business bzz subsidies as we did on subsidies related to employment (mostly unemployment insurance and employment service offices).

(Re agriculture (mostly the price-support program and payments under the soil bank program which we know benefit the rich the most. We spent more than four times as much on ~~rich~~ farmers than we did on the ~~rich~~ businessmen described above; more than seven times as much on farmers as we did on employed persons described above; more than 31 1/2 times as much on these farmers than on homeowners and tenants.)

We spent, in 1966, about as much on ship operating subsidies and administration as we did on all health research facility and private hospital construction programs. (All of this is net expenditures by the federal government, not including the indirect costs).

As the New York Times Editorial puts it: "Subsides need to be carefully reviewed in the light of clearly articulated priorities."

Farm price supports stabilize rural areas, it is argued. Housing programs help stabilize the cities. Is it fair to sink \$4 billion for the commercial farm operator, and less than \$400 million for urban renewal.

~~Business subsidies increase jobs; it is argued Employment expenditures stabilize the employment market~~

Business subsidies increase the demand side of the economy. Employment services help the supply side. It is fair to spend more than twice as much helping one small sector of the business economy (air and sea) than it is to help employees in all parts of the economy?



Remarks Of  
SENATOR WALTER F. MONDALE

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis  
Friday, October 25, 1968

November 5 is a little more than a week away.

By the measurement of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, it is still about five minutes to midnight.

One candidate for President of the United States seems to be deliberately building a platform of hate and distrust.

The past seven months have witnessed the violent destruction of two of our finest political leaders -- one black, the other white.

Another candidate for President of the United States has gone underground, seeking to capitalize on frustration and an early popular lead to avoid facing for now the world he must face soon if he wins.

A year that began with the hope of independence and even some freedom within the Soviet sphere of influence is coming to a close of despair in military oppression and strictures on the expression of thought.

A third candidate for President has suffered the most violent opposition and chastisement from within his own party in my memory.

November 5 is a little more than a week away.

And I come here to tell you that you must put your hopes for the future of America in the hands of Hubert Humphrey, as I have put mine there.

It is hard to believe that four short years ago the forces of delay and despair seemed to have been routed from the American political scene.

It is hard to believe that my first two years in the United States Senate so short a time ago seemed to be a time for fulfilling the hopes of 20 years.

It is hard to remember how much it seemed as if your generation of Americans might truly be the first in which the old and the young, the rich and the poor, the black and the white might share the hopes and the dreams of the American liberal commitment.

It has been a hard lesson we have all learned. And it is easy to understand how the Nixons and the Wallaces of this world might find their pleasure in our disappointment.

For we have been unable to fulfill that commitment, and some of us have been unwilling to do it. The gulf between our goals and our expenditures is great enough to allow the cry that "The rhetoric of public men. . . abounds in big ideas with small price tags. Or big ideas with no price tags at all."

But it is still true that what happens this Election Day will make a difference. For what we have before us, I believe, is the question of whether we have the courage to keep trying in spite of our disappointments -- in spite of our failures, if that is the way you would rather have it put.

There is only one candidate for President of the United States who wants to keep trying. He is Hubert H. Humphrey.

There is only one candidate who can accept disappointment and keep his dreams. He is Hubert H. Humphrey.

I believe it is time for all of us to face some facts about the Presidency of the United States and the part it plays in making the kind of world we want. Even though a President of the United States may be elected by the slimmest plurality, he sets the pace for the nation during his administration -- by his leadership, or lack of it; by his optimism, or lack of it; by his power of public persuasion, or lack of it; by his commitment to human progress -- or lack of it.

The Presidential campaign is a time to judge that pace. One of these men will be elected President. Only one man will have the opportunity and the responsibility of helping the Nation direct its choices as President.

One of the three will choose whether he will try to change the priorities that will assign \$80 billion to defense this coming year and \$28 billion for assistance of all kinds to the poor.

One of the three will choose whether to try to change the emphasis that has committed \$2.5 million for the Apollo television camera system and \$2 million to enforce open housing.



One of the three will make the budget proposal that this year assigns 42.6 per cent of our expenditures to defense activities and 27.6 per cent to all of our federal health, labor, and welfare activities.

One of these three men will have more than anyone else in the world to say about how we shall bring the war in Vietnam to an end -- how soon, in what way, under what conditions, for what purposes.

When that is done, one of these three men will have the opportunity to direct our use of the \$20 billion in funds that can become available during the next four years.

He will have to answer the question "What is important?" And believe me, it is a vital question.

One way to look at what is important is to ask whether we really want to spend more money in this country for the Apollo television system than we do to enforce the right of every American citizen to buy or rent a home anywhere he can afford it.

Another way is to look at the way in which priorities are assigned by those who pass the authorization and appropriations bills in our Congress.

In the first session of this 90th Congress, for example, the Congress authorized \$23.5 billion for military procurement and military construction purposes. To meet these needs, the Congress then appropriated \$22.2 billion. You can look at that as a billion-dollar cut if you want to, but it is also an appropriation at 94 per cent of the authorization.

~~In the same Congress, we authorized \$425 million for Food Stamps and appropriated \$185 million. That saved us \$240 million while some people went hungry. But it was an appropriation at 43 per cent of the authorization.~~

~~The difference between 94 per cent and 43 per cent tells you something about what this Congress thought was important.~~

~~And for the mental health program, the Congress appropriated 15 per cent of the authorization.~~ And the Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs received about a third in appropriation of what has been authorized.

Those aren't isolated examples. They reflect a general trend. In programs aimed at people, we are perfectly willing to sound generous by authorization and act stingy by appropriation. Figures for elementary and secondary education since 1965 show us passing higher and higher authorizations while the appropriations barely move off the 1965 mark. It's a trend that has to be bucked.

And who is President has a considerable amount to do with that. If we are going to turn these priorities around we will need a President who will insist on hard cash for social progress. We will need a President who will go to the people for support of these programs because he is dedicated to them.

I don't see that kind of leadership from the Republican Presidential candidate. And the third candidate has made it only too clear what the conditions are for his support of any programs for the needy, and he has told us what's important to him.

There is only one candidate who is on our side on this issue of what's important, one candidate who has gone to the people for support of better education and better homes and more jobs and a Marshall Plan for the Cities. That is Hubert Humphrey. He wants these things and is willing to fight to try to get them.

Hubert Humphrey will try to make us pay the bill for a better life in America. Richard Nixon would rather not mention it. George Wallace has an altogether different idea of what a better life is in America.

But that's not the only issue.

We need a President who will choose a strengthened United Nations over another Vietnam.

We need a president who will choose a nuclear non-proliferation treaty over an international arms race, who will choose an international disarmament treaty over an anti-ballistic missile system.

We need a President who will prefer the Peace Corps to the Central Intelligence Agency as an American ideological presence overseas.

Only one of these men will have the opportunity to influence those choices. They will not wait for another decade, just as the social problems of our nation will not wait for another decade.

I trust Hubert Humphrey to participate in those choices, and he is the only candidate I trust to do it. That is how it is.



This world is not going to stop to let any of us get off. There is no game that we can sit out.

There is a saying in the Law: "justice delayed is justice denied." Of the three candidates, George Wallace would nakedly deny justice to black people. Richard Nixon has adamantly refused to discuss the subject. He would therefore delay and in the end deny it.

Only Hubert Humphrey speaks for justice here and now, and he has not equivocated on this, North or South, in black neighborhoods or blue collar.

I have very grave personal doubts, based on literally hundreds of conversations with black leaders of every persuasion, whether this Nation can stand eight years of justice delayed. If this happens, and I think it will with a Nixon victory, then this nation will have become so unraveled that no President, your choice or mine, can hope to put the pieces back together again.

It will be a new game with different rules by the next time. There is only one thing you can do about change -- try to influence it in the direction you want. You can't wait for it to go away. It doesn't. Now becomes then.

That's really all I have to say.

I believe there is a tremendously important choice before us November 5. I believe it will make a difference to Don Fraser and Alan Cranston and Harold Hughes and Robert Kastenmeier who the next President of the United States is.

I believe it will make a difference to Walter Mondale and to the University of Minnesota and to the people of Minneapolis and St. Paul, their suburbs, and the surrounding countryside.

I believe it will make a difference to all of you, and I believe it will make a difference to all the world.

And the only tolerable President of the United States will be Hubert Humphrey. And you know it.

He needs the votes of those of you who can vote and the help of those of you who can help. It comes down in the end to a choice between hope and despair.

#####

appropriations bills in our Congress.

In the first session of this 90th Congress, for example, the Congress authorized \$23.5 billion for military procurement and military construction purposes. To meet these needs, the Congress then appropriated \$22.2 billion. You can look at that as a billion-dollar cut if you want to, but it is also an appropriation at 94 per cent of the authorization.

In the second session of the Congress, ~~we authorized \$280 million for hospital construction, but appropriated only \$258 million.~~

~~And~~ the elementary and secondary Education Act programs received only about a third in appropriations of what had been authorized.

Yet that ~~same~~ very same session of Congress passed an appropriation seven billion dollars higher for military procurement than had been authorized.

I think this tells you something about what this Congress thought was important.

Those aren't isolated examples. They reflect a general trend. In programs aimed at people, we are perfectly willing to sound generous by authorization and act stingy by appropriation. Figures for elementary and secondary education since 1965 show us passing higher authorizations



# MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in the Walter F. Mondale Papers belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



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