

Remarks by Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

to the

MNPL National Planning Committee and the IAM Executive Council and Staff

Friday, February 3, 1967  
Dupont Plaza Hotel  
Washington, D. C.

Introduction of the Vice President by International President Roy Siemiller:

We have had an acquaintance for many, many years. We are eternally grateful that he could take time out of what I know is about the busiest schedule of any public servant that I know of to come over here and be with us for a few minutes. Incidentally, I had dinner at the same table with him last night. He wouldn't eat with those people either, so he is strictly non-partisan.

Before introducing the Vice President, we do have with us the Administrative Assistant to Senator Mondale, one of the true great Senators in the United States, and I would like for Jerry Schaller to stand up and take a bow.

Now for whatever he wants to tell us, and I can assure you in advance that by his past performance we are going to agree with him, because for a long time the Machinists Union and our membership have been supporting the Vice President of the United States in his campaigns for public office starting when he ran for the mayor of Minneapolis. So ladies and gentlemen, the formal introduction would be the Vice President of the United States. I would rather say our friend, Hubert Humphrey.

The Vice President:

Thank you very much, my friend, President Siemiller. It's good to be here with you today. I was supposed to have had dinner with you last night and was to have had breakfast with you this morning; what are we doing for lunch, Roy? I hope

that you will understand why I did not come here to break bread with you this morning, but I have to keep peace on the home front. We have a nice new apartment that we are supposed to be living in, and every once in a while, Mrs. Humphrey thinks its a good idea if I stop by and have a cup of coffee. I did that this morning.

Last evening we, your President and the Vice President, joined together for supposedly what was a dinner, but I'll have to tell you about that last evening. I promised Mrs. Humphrey I was going to keep that evening open because it was the only evening that I had had open since the 27th day of December. Other than that we have been out, not we, but I, have been going from one meeting to another every single night. I might mention that everybody apparently thinks Congress is not going to last over a month or two, so all of the meetings are held in the months of January and February, and we generally pile on about five or six a day. Well, my friend Orville Freeman called me in the afternoon with a note of desperation in his voice and said, "Hubert, I'm going to be a little late tonight to a meeting that is a very important one for me. I have invited all the members of the House Agriculture Committee to come have supper with me but I can't be there on time. Do you think you could get on over and kind of fill in?" And that's what Vice Presidents are for, you know, so I said I'd planned on keeping this night open and he said, "Well, it won't take long, if you could do that I'd appreciate it." I said well that's fine. I'll try to do that.

Yesterday noon I was supposed to had met with sixty of the chiefs of Indian tribes and about a hundred of the other representatives of the tribe that were down here to talk to government officials about their problems - the war on poverty, Indian reservation problems, etc. - and they had all the chiefs over at the

Senate in one of the reception rooms and I was supposed to visit with them and have pictures taken and sort of just renew my membership in the tribe. So help me, just about the time I was ready to go over there, I got a call from the gentleman across the street at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue who said I'd like to have you come over for a bit. So I went on over and I was there for a little over two hours, and had to scratch that part of my schedule. Now the truth is, when we scratch out something on the schedule we don't scratch it out at all, we just move it around. My staff promised, "Don't worry we will have the Vice President over to the Indian Affairs Auditorium that night," and the hour I was told was between 7:30 and 8:00.

Then came the dinner where I found my friend Roy was going to speak. As I said last night, we sort of had a house-broken, tame Meet The Press, where they had business editors quizzing a number of people from labor and government and business, and one of them was your President. He got a real tough question and he came back with a good firm answer. The only difference is that when they ask Humphrey real tough questions they never tell me what the question is before so I can prepare the answer. But with Siemiller they gave him the question and let him have a chance to figure out the answer, and he did a good job. This they did by the way with all of them. Well, I was there last night to present an award to Mr. Watson of the International Business Machines (IBM) and that cleaned up that night. I didn't have any dinner. I just thought you ought to know when I got home about quarter to eleven or so, I looked around and Mrs. Humphrey was sewing. She said any man who doesn't have enough sense to eat dinner between 7:00 and 10:30 is not going to get dinner when he comes home to see me at that hour. I just thought you ought to know that things are about the same in my house as they are in yours. I think you also ought to know that we don't have anybody to fix us dinner either. Well enough of that.

I just wanted to fill you in on a few of the social amenities, some of the social highlights of my life.

This morning, as I have been told, we will have some questions and I will attempt to give you some answers. Before I do that I want to once again thank every single member that is here of the IAM. It is a fact that all of my public life I have had the privilege to benefit from and enjoy the support of the International Association of Machinists, their many lodges, and you as individual members and officers, and I am very proud of that good fortune. I know of no union, and I mean this without equivocation, that more fully represents the legitimate aspirations and aims of free trade unionsim than the IAM, and I'm proud to be a friend of this organization and am humbly grateful and proud that I have had the privilege of your support and hope that my public life may be so guided as to continue to merit that support.

Some of you at times must wonder about me, and must be like some others and say, I wonder what's happened to my friend Hubert Humphrey? I have to tell you this because I'm amongst friends and I want to talk very plainly and candidly to you. For 16 years I served in the United States Senate, and for those 16 years I gave everything that I had in terms of what I thought was best for my state and our country. In those 16 years, I think that I can say that I was an innovator. I didn't hesitate to try new things, to try to expound new ideas, to make new proposals. I never flinched in my support of the objectives and the aims of organized labor. I didn't then and I don't now. I have never had the labor movement ask me to do a single thing in my public life that I did not believe was in the national interest, and that's why I was happy to cast the votes that I did even though on occasion I must say that there were a number of people that weren't very happy about it.

I look back over those years, and as I've said to some of you in this room

as I look about, I can remember introducing Medicare on the 17th day of May, 1949, and being called every name in the book. The first bill I ever introduced in Congress on my own - the first bill - was a bill to provide medical care, hospital and nursing home care to those persons aged 65 and over under the terms of Social Security, and I introduced that bill every year of every two years either as a main sponsor or a co-sponsor until the day that it was passed. And I had the privilege of being Vice President of the United States when that bill was finally signed in the presence of the former President of the United States Harry Truman, whose own health commission made that recommendation back in 1948, and I was privileged to put the bill in the hopper in the next term of Congress in 1949. I am very proud of the fact that I have had the opportunity to author a peace corps, an arms control agency, a national defense education act, a wilderness bill, and on everyone of these we received a heap of abuse at the time that it was introduced, only to live long enough in public life to see each and every one of them become law - and each and every one of the proposals, I think, add to the public good.

As a Senator you are a totally independent man, and I have said to my young friends in the Senate if you are worth your salt as a Senator you will do two things: you'll take care of the immediate - that which is pressing you at this day, and you will look ten years ahead, because a Senator has a six-year term and for at least five of those six years he ought to be willing to look far ahead. As he gets a little closer to the sixth year, he may want to slow down some, but at the first year of that term he ought to look about 15 years ahead. And as he gets to about the fifth year of that six-year term he may only want to look a few months ahead. I'm not going to be critical of that. But we all know pretty much what the issues are for 1967 and you ought to be looking ahead to the issues of 1970 and 1972 and 1975, because time moves

rapidly. I felt that I had that opportunity.

Some people have said you know I think the Vice President, Mr. Humphrey, has changed, and I have to tell them no I haven't changed. My job did, that is the difference. It is one thing to be a member of a union, its another thing to be the shop steward, its another thing to be the business agent, and another thing to be the president of an organization. I've watched the Machinists. I know what they can do, even to the presidents of their organization, when you arrive at certain collective bargaining agreements. And so, a man's responsibilities are entirely different, and I want to make it quite clear that I am the Vice President of the United States, which makes me the partner of the President of the United States. I wouldn't be worth much to you or anybody else if I spent my time trying to make the life of the president more complicated. He has enough trouble without it from me. So I made a vow when I became Vice President that I would do everything within my power to help the President. I would surely do everything within my power not to embarrass the President, and above all, I would do everything that I could to try to help our country. Those are my objectives, and if the price of my popularity is to go around nitpicking at the President, it's too high a price. If the price of my being popular with certain groups is to get out of step and get out of line and proceed publicly to embarrass the Administration, it's too high a price. I can easily do that. All I have to do is not serve in this job. But once I took on the responsibility of Vice President, I consider that my obligation is to do my fighting on whatever views I have within the councils of the Administration, not outside. And that's why you don't frequently see Hubert Humphrey's name in bold print. I have people say to me once in a while, "Why don't you challenge the Administration on this or that? Do you agree with that? Do you agree with this?" Most everything I agree with. I helped make that policy -

at least I advise on it. Only one man makes it ultimately, and that's the President, after he receives advice and counsel. But, I have said quite candidly for the 16 years I stood in the Senate and I was able to speak loudly and often trying to get my voice heard in the White House or in a department of government, and I had to speak loudly in order for it to be heard at all, and often. Now I'm inside of the Administration establishment. I'm an inside member, and I can speak softly enough so I can be heard there and not heard on the outside. That is the difference. And that's the way it's going to be. I haven't given up one single principle nor have I changed my views particularly on one single matter. I possibly have matured, I hope, but I have stood steadfast by what I consider to be the liberal progressive principles of government to which I dedicated my life 25 years ago. I haven't changed one little bit.

So now let's have your questions and I will see whether I have changed or not. The first one is a very, very difficult question, and I must say I think I'm in the wrong union for it because this is not the Musicians Union nor is it AFRA.

Q. When are you going to make a record?

A. Well, just as soon as my hair is curly and my voice is melodious.

Q. How are chances to raise income tax deductions from the present \$600 to \$1,000?

A. Right now not very good. In fact I don't think there is any chance at this particular Congress. But I would say that once we can get this miserable struggle in Southeast Asia behind us, and we have good reason and hope that it will be behind us, we will be able to revise our tax laws considerably. There are several proposals before us - the sharing with the state and local governments some of the federal revenues, and again I go back to what I said. Year after year, I introduced in the Congress proposals to increase the deduction of \$600 to \$800, \$600 to \$750, \$600 to \$800 again, and in light of present price structure the proposal to raise income

tax deductions from \$600 to \$1,000 is undoubtedly one of the proposals that will receive high priority when and if we can reduce our defense expenditures so that the budget is a manageable item. I would hope that your political education committee would keep plugging away at this, not on the basis of getting this done tomorrow or this year, because you know it won't, but on the basis of sound economics and social justice, when and if such a time comes. And it will come. We know that, so we need to look ahead.

Q. Do you believe that Senator Magnuson and yourself can get funds for the SST?

A. Yes. Let me just say a word about the SST. I am chairman of the Space Council. I am very familiar with the whole problem of the SST. I visited the plants before the design was approved, the one that was selected at Boeing. I was at both Lockheed and Boeing. I worked with the men in the aeronautical industry, and I just want to say this, there is a lot of loose talk in Congress about the SST on the basis that this is somehow or other just another give away or that it's a boondoggle, or that it's something that we can put aside and not worry about it. The largest single export item of the United States for years has been aircraft. We have been preeminent in aircraft. American planes fly the routes of the world. Now my fellow Americans you can lose that preeminence very quickly. There are others who are challenging us every day, including the Soviet Union. And, believe it or not, they will be happy to sell to capitalist nations. I don't think we should be second best in anything we can be first best in. We know from the economics of the SST that it can be designed, that it can be marketable, that it can over a period of time repay the government every nickel that has been put into it for design and for prototype and for engineering, and we know that it can be a very important export item.

It is going to be built, you know. Somebody is going to build it and the airlines are going to fly it. The only question is who is going to sell it? And the American airlines which have great roots are not going to wait forever for an American built supersonic transport. The Concord is ahead of us already, and its entirely probable that within the year, or a year and a half, or two years, the Soviet Union . . . . and for doing something about it in this fiscal year.

I think you can rest assured that we are working with the aircraft companies, the airlines and the government to work out a formula to move this SST program along because it has to be built. It will be built. The only question is who is going to build it? Are you going to build it, the IAM? Are you going to build it, and Boeing, and General Electric with their motors, or are the French and the British going to build it, and the Russians? That's the only question. I think we are going to build it, and get on with the job.

Q. Would you comment on the future of the study of oceanography in the Puget Sound area of Washington State?

A. Let me say a little bit about oceanography. You know as the Vice President I ought to come down here sometime and tell you about this job of mine. It's a wonderful privilege to be Vice President of the United States and its grown in responsibility since the first days of our country, thank goodness. John Adams once said that the Vice Presidency is nothing or it's everything, but it's a mix now. There are many duties that we have. I am the President's liaison with the local government officials, the mayors. I am the chairman of the Peace Corps Advisory Committee, the chairman of the Office of Economic Opportunity Council, coordinating many of our social programs. I am the chairman of the President's Committee on Youth Opportunity. I am a member of the Cabinet and the National Security Council. I am

a general practitioner and a specialist in none. That's just about what it boils down to, and that's all right because we have department heads that run departments. The Vice President is a coordinator and advisor, but not an administrator. He is not supposed to be one. You have too many administrators and you get nothing but trouble. We have people that have the duty to administer and to run programs. The Vice President is an extension of the Presidency so to speak. He is used for the purposes of coordination, of consultation, of advice and counsel, and to expedite things. I am chairman, by an act of Congress, of two important Councils. The Space Council is what brought me into SST. This Space Council consists of the Director of NASA, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Director of the U.S. Information Agency, and other people that serve on it are members like the President's Science Advisor and so forth. It's a council to coordinate all the efforts of this government in the field of space - peaceful and military - including the Atomic Energy Commission and its activities in building rockets and engines for space travel.

The Congress made the Vice President chairman of that and there is a reason for it. Because the only man who can really chair a group of equals is someone, who is not necessarily above the equals, but not a member of that particular group. It is probably very difficult to have another Cabinet officer chair a committee of Cabinet officers. The President obviously can't be doing all of this, so the Vice Presidency has been put to work, to be in a position in between the President and the Cabinet officers, to act as the agent of the Congress and the President, to coordinate activity. So I'm chairman of the Space Council. I am chairman of the Council of Marine Resources, Engineering and Development - commonly known as oceanography, the study of the oceans, the currents, the temperatures, the study of the ocean floor, and all the possibilities that come out of the ocean and its ocean life and environment. As I said last night

when we were at this banquet with Roy, everytime the Congress gives me something to do as the Vice President they either give me something to do that is out of this world like space or at the bottom of the ocean such as oceanography. I said I wonder if you can read anything into that. But it's a fascinating experience.

Let me tell you what this has meant to me. It has brought me in touch with science and technology and the effect of science and technology upon our economy and our life as people and a nation. Its the most interesting assignment that I have ever had. And of all of the interesting assignments, oceanography is surely close to the top of the list.

Now space is fascinating. I know the astronauts, and let me tell you, when these three young men lost their lives, I was heartbroken. It was almost like a member of my family. I traveled to Paris with Colonel White and his wife Pat. I called these young ladies on the telephone the day after the death of their husbands. I know them, I have been with them, and I sat up an hour and a half or two hours with them when they came here to Washington. I went over to see them just as you would your neighbor. You get very close to these people because they are a wonderful group.

Well, moving to oceanography, this is new. Congress passed this act on oceanography in July. We've got a big program going right now. There is additional money in the budget for it. We are coordinating the activities of our government. What does it mean? It means that we are going to explore the oceans to the ultimate, because the ocean is an environment just like the atmosphere or space. Seventy percent of the earth's surface is water. I told the President one time, "Well Mr. President, we're giving you thirty percent and I'm taking seventy percent. That's the way we divide it up now." Of course, that presumes that he has all the earth's land surface and I have all the water. But in all honesty, this environment of the seas and

the oceans is, I think, going to change our life even more than space. We are going to be able to farm the seas just like we farm land. We have already been able to get approval of fish protein concentrate. This didn't come by accident. I have been working closely with the Food and Drug Administration and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. You know what fish protein concentrate means? It means that we can prevent world starvation. Now, for one penny a day you can provide enough protein for a man, an adult person, for one penny a day. And the greatest deficiency in the world today is protein. Protein deficiency stunts growth, inhibits the development of the mind and causes physical disability. It does actually inhibit the development of the mind; it promotes mental retardation and mental illness. Now, for less than one penny a day, right now its a penny, we can provide all the fish protein concentrate that is necessary for balanced protein intake for the human body. Just imagine what this means, and we have now got it. And we are going to establish plants around the world - pilot plants - to develop this fish protein concentrate, to promote its distribution, to encourage its use. But let me tell you what else, we are going to mine the bottoms of the ocean. Right off the coast of Florida, gentlemen, right off from Cape Kennedy just a few miles out, is 12,000 square miles of solid manganese. You just pick it right up. They have what they call an aluminaut. It's a little submarine that goes down with huge arms out in front of it and hands that are manipulated from inside. I've been in it. You go down to the bottom of the ocean, and the floor is as black as the ace of spades, and you dig down with those hands and pull out a solid piece of metal, manganese - almost pure manganese.

There are literally billions of millions of tons of copper on the ocean floor, besides oil and gas of unlimited quantity. There are to be found vast deposits of gold off the estuaries of the rivers in Alaska that have so to speak already been cleansed. You know the old prospectors used to go out by the stream and try to find

the gold leaf and the gold flake from the sands. Well it's there. We have found it already by sensors. We know from overflights of aircraft, through ticker-type sensors, as we call them, that we can discover this metal, and it's only a matter now of getting at it.

Now we are going to develop in our universities people that are competent in this area. Let me give you one example. One aircraft company wanted to hire 1200 oceanographers, and you gentlemen now, many of you work in aircraft. If for example, aircraft production would taper off, oceanography fits right in. It's right in your bailiwick. Everyone of you right here, and I'll predict that if I can come back here 10 years from now, that we will be talking about jobs that your men have in your union in the field of oceanography in the development of oceanographic equipment. And so the Puget Sound area is obviously right in the forefront. As a matter of fact, the University of Washington and Washington State are two of the great institutions along with the University of Miami, the University of California down at Loyola, and up here at Woods Hole in Massachusetts.

These are the great oceanographic institutions and this past year we passed a bill in Congress to aid those institutions in what we call Sea-Grant funds, just like you have Land-Grant Colleges. Purdue, Cornell, University of Minnesota, University of Wisconsin, Oklahoma and Illinois - these are what we call Land-Grant Colleges. We are now going to have Sea-Grant Colleges and explore that other part of the world known as the sea.

Q. Transportation problem in all big cities is unbearable. How soon is the problem going to be solved?

A. Well, there comes a time when a man ought to say I don't know. I don't know really. I do know this, we have at least laid the ground work for the

the solution of this problem.

By the way, let me just use this card for an observation. We have talked so much about the fabulous, incredible 89th Congress, and I must say when you look back over it, what happened in that Congress is nothing short of miraculous. I think I ought to let you in on a little secret. The President and his Vice President knew that we most likely wouldn't have a Congress like that again in our lifetime. Because the victory we had in 1964 was an unusual victory. It isn't the normal pattern of American politics and we didn't kid ourselves. We knew what could happen. What happened in 1966 and 1962 was more of the normal pattern. That's the kind of break that you get - the even split. Hopefully that it won't be any worse, but that is about it. So when we had that great majority in the Congress we went for every piece of legislation that we thought that Congress could pass. We just put ourselves to the task of passing legislation that was long overdue in this country, knowing full well that maybe not another time in our lifetime would we have that same opportunity.

Now, what kind of legislation? Legislation that redressed old greivances. You have heard many people say well this is a lot of old stuff those folks passed. Well, it was old stuff that we couldn't pass before, but no legislative proposal - let's put it this way - very few are passed quickly. Just like building a union, you don't build it overnight. Not on your life. You didn't get the working conditions that you have today because somebody was a miracle man fifty years ago or thirty years ago. You had to work for it. Build it, build it, strike, work, fight! That's the way you did it. That's the way we have to work for legislation. But we got a lot of legislation passed in the 89th Congress that redressed old greivances and we also passed legislation looking to the future.

Much of that legislation has never had a chance to go to work yet, and

when we went to the ballot box last November, people said well they passed a lot, but I don't see much happening. The answer was that much had been passed in September and October of that very year. It had not been funded. For example, the Model Cities program. It relates to the rebuilding of our cities. Even with that Congress we couldn't get all we wanted. We had a \$5 billion program outlined and we got \$2 billion. And when I hear Senators say what we need is \$100 billion, I say where were you when we were trying to get \$5 billion? There's a little difference, you know. I've been up there. I know the difference between a dream and reality, boys, and between fiction and fact - I've indulged in both. But we passed a good deal of legislation that is in the storehouse, so to speak, ready to go to work, when and if we can put it to work.

One of them is on mass transit. One of them is on this system of transportation that can modernize our whole urban transportation system. Now we have just barely got started on it. All we had was a little seed money, but there it is. It's there. It's passed. You know Franklin Roosevelt was responsible for the passage of the Social Security Act. It didn't amount to much when he first passed it, didn't give many benefits, but it was passed. Once you break through, it's like Orville Wright with that old Kittie Hawk. Once he got that blame old thing up for twelve seconds, flying at an average speed of fifty miles an hour, for a hundred yards, we soon were looking to the supersonic transport. That was the breakthrough. You had to get the old Kittie Hawk up first.

We have passed a good deal of legislation on which we are going to build, and part of it is in this field of transportation. The miracle of the 89th Congress, or the greatness of it, is not so much what it did for now as what it will do for the future. Once we pass, for example, a program like Medicare for the elderly, we know now that we can do much more for our children. Once we had passed legislation that

that got away from the concept of strictly public housing for the poor, we now know that we can do much more with so-called low-income private housing from non-profit corporations or even profit corporations to build for the poor. So we will look ahead to the day, and it won't be too long, because we have made the breakthrough to meet these urban transportation problems. Good Lord, I guess the easy way to say it to you is, if you can get to the moon, you ought to be able to get to Pittsburgh. By the way, once you get into town, you ought to be able to move around too.

Q. Do you plan to have a wage and price freeze this year?

A. Absolutely not.

Q. Does the Democratic Party have a candidate that can beat Senator Dirksen in Illinois?

A. Ask Roy Siemiller.

Q. Will there be any labor legislation enacted in this session of Congress?

A. I doubt it, I doubt it - neither good nor bad.

Q. Do you think Congress will approve the merger of the Commerce and Labor Department?

A. I just lost my voice. Let me say that I think on this one that it needs a good deal of airing and it's going to have a good deal of it. Many people that are for it. I know there has been some expression of the labor movement for it and there has been some expression from some areas of business for it, but I think in all candor there have been expressions privately from the same groups against it. . .

. . . Frankly, I have my serious doubts, and I think that we ought to wait before we pass judgment. I think there is great merit, from my own point of

view, in this so-called merger, but you better lay down the guidelines pretty carefully as to what the responsibilities are of that Department. That's all I'm saying. I'll be quite free and open in my discussion with you. I used to teach courses in public administration. I sometimes feel I owe all of my students a refund. I know that it's important to have these departments of government properly organized. I know that, and the federal establishment does organize, and reorganize, again and again. Much more, may I say, than state governments do and local governments. In fact one of the great needs in America today is to put all levels of government on a more modern basis, to properly staff state and local governments with competent personnel, with adequate taxing authority, with proper regulatory authority, modernized state constitutions for the 20th Century - in fact for the 21st Century, because we are in the last third of the 20th Century, gentlemen and ladies, the last third of the 20th Century.

Most of the audiences I talk to now are going to be living in the year 2000. They are going to be living in the year 2000 and they are going to be literally at their peak of ability and competence. When you are out talking to these high school audiences and college audiences, and young people's audiences, they are going to be in business running this country in the year 2000. So I think that whatever we do now we ought to keep in mind that we have to streamline our government, organize our government, not for the immediate but for days ahead that will be affected by automation, that will be affected by a world that is being brought closer and closer together through communications satellites, a world that will be conditioned by a spirit of international cooperation such as we have never known, or international animosity - and that's being decided these present days. We hope it will be the spirit of cooperation. So when I look ahead at a department like a new Department

of Labor and Commerce, or Labor and Business, whatever you wish to call it, I want to think ahead far enough as to what the department will do, not just for today but the days in the future, and I think we need to air it a great deal.

I have said about public administration that everybody in Washington is for coordination. Everytime you pick up the paper - you just look at the paper this morning - they have a couple of nice columns on coordinate this, coordinate that. Well, I want to tell you that there are some professional coordinators around this town and sometimes you can just coordinate apathy, you can coordinate indifference. I'll tell you what Humphrey is for. Humphrey is not only for coordination, he's for inspiration, he is for dedication, he's for competition. I think that if you've got enough people on the job on the stick, moving, pushing, working, you don't need to worry so much about coordination. People in order to catch up will have to coordinate a little bit if you're moving out. I wouldn't want to be misunderstood though. Of course we want good management, but some of the people that worry me the most in this city are people who haven't had a new idea for a long time but they will say well, now let's coordinate. Coordinate. Franklin Roosevelt got things done and so did Harry Truman and John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson, and they got things done because they were activists, because they had programs and policies, and they moved and they maybe didn't always coordinate everything so good but at least they got something moving for the good of the country.

Q. Will the poverty program, particularly the Job Corps, be hurt in Congress?

A. Gentlemen and ladies, the poverty program is going to be in trouble in this Congress unless we can mobilize the resources to prevent it from being in trouble. This program is causing a great deal of comment around the country because

it is different. Now we could add \$2 billion to welfare assistance. Two billion dollars is what's in the OEO budget this year. That's about \$400 million more than last year. Not as much as we'd need but more than we got, and if we get \$2 billion it will be nothing short of a legislative miracle this year.

But what are we doing with this poverty program? We are not trying to make poverty more tolerable. This isn't a pain releiver. We are trying to find some answers to this old malignancy, this old disease that has been hanging on since the beginning of time called poverty. And my dear friends, we are making some inroads. We are making some inroads into this disease, just like we are beginning to find out a little bit more about cancer. Now we haven't found the cure for cancer, but we are finding certain drugs and certain treatments that inhibit it, retard it, and with proper early treatment, can cure it. But we haven't found a cure for all types of cancer. It is a terrible disease. I look over a room like this and I know when I look at you that one out of every five will have it, and one out of three will die of it. That's what it means. I've had this in my family and I want to tell you when it hits your family, brother, you really know that it's something. So, you long, you watch the news, you watch the medical bulletins - are they finding any answers? Well now imagine if you were from a poverty stricken family and have a little something left of you of spirit. And, of course, the real curse of poverty is not the economic poverty, because that can be overcome. The real curse of poverty is the poverty of the spirit, the despair, the hopelessness, the frustration, the bitterness, the utter indifference, and finally the breakdown of the human body, the human spirit. That's the kind of poverty that is really gripping the country.

Anybody today that has a modicum of skill or talent that is ascertainable, that is there, he gets a job. You know that. He may have to wait a little bit in some

community but the people that are unemployed today, in the main, except those who are in transition between jobs, or have some technological unemployment temporarily, those people are really today in a large measure unemployables under present standards. What we are trying to do with the poverty program is to go in and find out how to motivate people. How do you get them to want to do something for themselves. We are experimenting. We are trying to find cures. We are not trying to find another pain releiver. I've seen cancer patients doped up with pain releivers to a point where finally the pain releiver wouldn't dope them up anymore. And we've seen that in poverty. We have given people assistance and assistance, and finding that no amount of assistance helps at all. So what we are looking for now is an approach that gives some answers.

We are working particularly with young people - in Project Head Start, in the Job Corps program, in adult education, in literacy training and a host of activities. I've seen it at work. Let me give you an example. Again we go back to Illinois where they had terrible race riots in Chicago this year. In Chicago, they put together in seven of the poverty areas of that city what they call Urban Progress Centers. Now these Urban Progress Centers are buildings that were unoccupied, that had been changed over into a kind of an office building. They are not beautiful at all. They represent the community in the poverty areas, and in those buildings are to be found the representatives of every state and local and federal agency that has a program that could affect the lives of these people in that area. That's coordination. Not up here in Washington where you draw designs and put them on the wall, and charts, but out there when a patient, so to speak, when a victim of poverty walks in that door, it's like coming into a clinic, and that patient or that victim of poverty will have some care, some counseling, some advice, some orientation, hopefully to lead that person

out of that sickness of poverty into a new and healthy life. And, I have seen it.

Let me give you an example. A factory advertises for 100 workers, unskilled. We'd get 100 job applicants and we'd send 100 people to that factory - the kind of people that I am talking about. Of the 100 that go, on the second day 95 have left the job; five have stayed. In another community, we send 100 and 90 leave the job the first week. They don't stay. Now why don't they stay? First of all they have never been trained to work. They are filled with hostility. They are filled with despair. They maybe didn't catch the bus on time and since they knew they were going to be late they didn't turn up at all. They didn't want to go through that shame. Believe it or not, they have a sense of shame, inadequacy, and we know this is the case. We have done this in city after city. Cleveland, Philadelphia, New York, Detroit, Chicago, San Francisco, Los Angeles, the ratio is the same: 100 jobs are open. A good employer, the labor movement gets together, the Community Chest. They say give us 100 jobs, 100 jobs are there. Send 100 people out, 90 leave, 10 stay. Send 100 out, five stay, 95 leave.

What do we do now? We go out and have to recruit from the poverty areas. In Chicago in the Urban Progress Center they have what they call "community representatives" (CRs). Who are these community representatives? Not men with Harvard degrees. They are poor people from the poor area who know the poor people, who know the whole area. You know how they get applicants? They go out like an insurance salesman and they sell opportunity. They go to the bars, the taverns, the back alleys, the boy gangs and they walk right in and say look come with me, I want you to go down to the Urban Progress Center. They recruit them, and believe it or not, that's what you've got to do. There were 32 pages of want ads in the Chicago papers three weeks ago when I was there. Thirty-two pages of job opportunities, and yet

you can go into area after area and a guy is standing on the corner. They are just hostile or apathetic. You've got to go in and find those people and convince them that there is a hope at the end of the line for them. There is a hope and a reality. Here is what happens. They come in and they get a two-week or a four-week orientation. Simple things. Believe it or not, they teach them how to keep clean, just reasonably clean; teach them how to groom, just a little bit; teach them that when they get an interview it isn't going to go to the police, because many of these people have had a brush with the police and they are worried. They think that if they come into any building that's got government on it at all, that it is going to be put right down to the police department and they are going to be picked up for old bills or something else. These are people who have vanished for all practical purposes. They are hiding away from the law, hiding away from responsibility. It's a job of confidence, of selling. It's a job of literally teaching a child how to walk, and you teach them such simple things, for example, how to get on a bus and follow a map and get to the place of employment. You simulate a factory experience. How to punch a time clock. It takes two to three days to teach many a man, believe it or not, how to punch a time clock, what to do on a coffee break, and how to act around a factory, what the relation is of the union steward in the shop and the formen, and so forth. They teach them these things.

Now, what is the result of this? I've seen it. A hundred men go for a job, eighty-five stay. That's the average. Not five stay, eighty-five. In the city of Philadelphia last year one group known as OIC, the Reverend Leon Sullivan, a Negro minister, starting with just a few Negro churches, and finally getting some help from the labor movement and the Chamber of Commerce, and finally getting a grant from the Ford Foundation, was able to provide jobs for and train over 2000 workers, hard-

core, unemployed, never-before-employed workers and increased the payroll by \$8 million in one city. He has 65 of these centers going now in 65 cities. It's not government, it's not private. It's a mix, and that is what we've got to do. The OEO, the war on poverty program, the Labor Department, make some contribution. The Community Chest, foundations, churches, labor movements, all pitch in and we're training thousands of workers. Right this moment as I speak to you, there are 800,000 men and women in some form of training. We are going to break the back of this poverty, most of it. But we can't do it over night. And what happens is everytime somebody gets a check that he didn't earn, every time some fellow goofs on the job, and that happens in the best of places, that's the headline. Every time there is a little trouble at a Job Corps Center, that's the headline. And I keep hearing people say of the Job Corps Center, too costly. It is costly. The first year it was very costly. The second year it was less costly. This year it will be less, because the first year the government has such ridiculous budgeting practices that it has to pay for all the facilities the first year, all the books.

Who are we getting into these Job Corps Centers? Well, I read the other day an editorial that said a particular Job Corps Center had a 35% dropout of all of its Job Corps enrollees. The editor said why don't we close up this boondoggle, waste of money? He forgot to remember of the first enrollees a 100% when they came in were dropouts - 100% of them. He forgot to remember that in that center, over 30% of them could neither read nor write. He ought to be ashamed to live in a time when that happened. But we're getting jobs now for the Job Corps trainees, those that stay, and that's about 65-70%. But if 50% stay, it's 50% more than you ever had before. How much does it cost to have an unemployed person? How much does it cost to have a delinquent? How much frustration and bitterness does it cost to have this kind of

attitude that comes from continued unemployment? How many riots? How much waste of property? Listen, the best bargain this country's ever got is in the poverty program. The best bargain it ever had. And I want to tell you that Hubert Humphrey feels that with my life as good as it is, the least I can do is be willing to share just a little bit to help make somebody else's life a little bit better. It's a selfish thing in a sense, because it helps me and it helps everybody. We are going to see that these people, as the President has put it, are not tax eaters but taxpayers, that they are not consumers of other people's products that they give nothing to, but producers of products for other people to which they can give something. And we are going to need your help. There were 2,000 ministers here in Washington the other day. They came in here to protest Vietnam. That's a man's right. The country guards jealously the right of protest, and every member of the labor movement knows how important this is. But when they were here, I wish they had called on every single member of Congress and said listen there is something in the scriptures about blessed are the poor. The least of these, it is best to minister than to be ministered unto. He who would be first let him be last. I think it would have been good if we had talked about what we could do to help lift the burden of poverty from our own people.

Now, I'm one of these people who believe that we can help throughout the world, but I want to lay it on the line. You're not going to be able to help India if you can't help Washington. You're not going to be able to help Africa and Asia and Latin America if you can't do it here where we all speak the same language and we're in the same country. If we can't win the war on poverty in our country with what we have here, with our fabulous resources, with our school system, with our labor movement, our business enterprise, our churches, our government. If we can't do it here, how in the name of common sense do you think we can win it in Brazil or

win it in Pakistan or Vietnam or someplace else. You can't possibly do it. We have to set the example, and Hubert Humphrey, Vice President of the United States, supports Lyndon Johnson, President of the United States, in our effort to open up these doors of opportunity. And not only open them up to everybody, but to help people walk through those doors. It is one thing to open up the door to a man that has been paralyzed behind those closed doors, but it does no good to open up a door for a paralytic unless you can teach him how to walk. And we are trying to teach him how to walk. We have opened the door. We have passed the civil rights acts. We have had a host of programs that are authorized. Now we've got to get a hold of this cripple, and by the way they are just like cripples, many of these people. They are just as crippled as a man that has a distorted and broken body. They are spiritually crippled. They are physically crippled, many of them, and they are intellectually crippled or educationally crippled. We have to teach those cripples of our society to walk once again, just like you would teach a person who had a twisted arm how to use that hand again. We are going to do it, and I want you to bend every effort.

Listen my friends of the labor movement, let's show this country that the labor movement is interested in these great social welfare programs. Let's not run away from them. I keep hearing that this last election was a repudiation of the Great Society. It was not at all, and if it was, then it's all the more inspiration to us to do something about it, because what we have been doing in the so-called great society programs is to advance the opportunities in the fields of health, of education, of jobs, of training, of social betterment. And I'm for it, and I don't give a hoot if the whole country votes against it, I'm still going to be for it, and I'm going to go on out and get a lot of other people to be for it, if we can get somebody to listen and somebody to walk along side of us.

Roy Siemiller:

Hubert, Mr. Vice President, I can assure that you are going to find this union backing the programs that you talked about this morning. We have a long history, which you know, and that history has been right down the line of what you are talking about. We are not one of the flamboyant unions that talks about pie in the sky. We haven't sought the headlines like some of our sister unions and some of their presidents with a new idea every three days. But it has been a hard working union, constantly following along this particular line. We can pledge you unqualified support of the greatest majority of the membership of this union. I should tell you that we have a few kooks as members also, but as I . . .

. . . We may be ahead of him on some of them because we are going to push like mad for the SST, we are going to rally every support we can get to go along with us to get a personal exemption for each tax payer of \$1,000. We are out in front with this program and you're going to find the Machinists Union either walking with you, and I doubt very much if we are going to get ahead of you, but we will be right along side of you. Thank you so much for coming over.



# Minnesota Historical Society

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

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



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