

New York City
Americana Hotel
October 12, 1964

I will not call you "Fellow Democrats" because I have a feeling that some of you are good Republicans. I will, however, speak of you, and to you, as friends and fellow Americans. And I bring warm greetings and thanks from President Johnson.

The President is looking forward to your advice and help on a continuing basis after the election. He has worked hard to establish a constructive partnership between business and government. He has sought to develop a climate in which all Americans, regardless of income level, occupation, race or creed can prosper and move forward. And I believe he has succeeded. The proof of that is your presence here today.

Before this campaign, there were those who contended that American business leaders were forever dedicated to whatever candidate gained control of the Republican Party.

I did not believe this. I knew too many of you -- I had worked too often with you in the interest of the country. I was convinced that the intelligence and objectivity required in business would rule in evaluating the respective candidates and proposals. And it has.

A well-stocked arsenal of anti-government slogans -- the principal weapon of our opposition -- will not substitute for proven competence in the management of our government, or a sympathetic concern by government for the legitimate problems of the business world. The choice is simply this: proven competence versus empty slogans.

The fact is that the American businessman is not well served at home or abroad by a "do nothing" government. We must have a national administration with the wisdom, imagination and courage to serve effectively the interests of all the people. This calls for hard work and this

calls for skill and experience.

Let me be more specific. The chief role of government is to support -- not supplant -- the private enterprise system.

When a lack of private credit stifles business growth, government action should be taken.

When tax incentives are needed to encourage private investment, the government must act.

When business firms seek to compete successfully in the markets of the world, government must act to remove international trade barriers.

When massive investment beyond the means of private business is required for pioneering efforts in space, communications, atomic energy or aviation, government has a crucial role as an investment partner.

In this role of creative and constructive partnership, government must always recognize the legitimacy

of profits for businessmen. Profits are rewards for successful risk-taking, ingenuity and hard work. Not only are such profits fair, their reinvestment in an expanding economy benefits everyone.

We need a government that is not afraid of mere bigness in business for its own sake, but understands that expanding markets and growing economic opportunities provide business the means to stimulate competition and to avoid restraints on trade.

We need a government that encourages private investment in foreign countries. In Latin America, an area of special concern to me, it has become increasingly evident that private investment is essential and welcomed.

We must make certain that a climate of encouragement continues, and that a large portion of that investment comes from United States businesses.

In the final analysis, Presidential elections are a choice between two rival candidates -- their records, their abilities, their statements, their opinions, and their supporters. Lyndon B. Johnson brings to the American business community a proven record of faith in private enterprise, a demonstrated understanding of its dynamics and needs, and a mature view of the proper role of government participating constructively in a free, private economy.

You need take nothing on faith. The record is clear and speaks for itself. As businessmen and Americans you know we must keep America moving forward in peace and security. And Lyndon B. Johnson possesses the maturity, the understanding, the experience, the courage, and the responsibility to accomplish this objective.

Remarks of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
Foreign Language Press Conference
Americana Hotel
October 12, 1964

Participants: The Honorable Robert F. Wagner, Mayor of New York City; Robert F. Kennedy, Candidate for the United States Senate from the State of New York; the Honorable Averell Harriman; Julius C. C. Edelstein, Executive Assistant to Mayor Wagner; and Members of the Foreign Press.

Mr. Edelstein. Ladies and gentlemen, this is, as you know, the press conference called by the All-Americans Council for the foreign language press for the candidate for Vice-President, Senator Humphrey, and so the first round of questions will, of course, be for the foreign language press, and to Senator Humphrey. Mayor Wagner as the Chairman of the All-Americans Council -- (Applause) will preside and present Senator Humphrey.

Mayor Wagner. Ladies and gentlemen, before introducing our next Vice-President -- (Applause) -- I know we are very, very pleased, too, to have the distinguished candidate, our candidate for the United States Senate here, too, Bobby Kennedy -- (Applause) -- and a **very** distinguished statesman and former Governor of the State, our good friend, Averell Harriman -- (Applause) -- and our National Committeeman, Ed Weisl. (Applause) City Councilman, Klaus Screvane -- (Applause) -- and Bill Ryan here. (Applause)

I know you want to get on with the questions, but as Chairman of the All-Americans Council, which as you know is the former Nationalities Division of the Democratic National Committee, I am very, very proud to have this opportunity to introduce an old friend, and I am sure all of you know well, and all of you admire.

I know of no one who has made greater contributions in the Senate to liberalism and progress, who understands the problems of our people and the problems of the world better than the one I am to introduce. And I know that I introduce him, too, as an old friend and as Chairman of the All-Americans Council which as you know is dedicated to bringing to all of our people the principles of our Party and the platforms of our candidates.

He is a former chairman of our old Nationalities Division, and therefore he has had a unique opportunity through that service and also his great knowledge and experience traveling to know all of the problems that face the world today, that face us nationally, and I know of no one better equipped to assume the position of Vice-President with Lyndon Johnson than our dear friend, Hubert Humphrey. I am delighted to have him here. (Applause)

Senator Humphrey. Thank you very much, Mr. Mayor. I don't know which one of these is working. You have got such a galaxy of electronic instruments here.

I must say that it is a wonderful privilege to not only be with my good friends of the Democratic Party, those esteemed and distinguished citizens, but with this very notable representation of the foreign language press of the Fourth Estate, and I shan't take any more of your time with any particular statement on my part. I merely want to say how pleased I am for the opportunity of being with you, and I hope that during this brief discussion that we may have it that I can be of some help in either clarifying a position or of answering your questions appropriately and properly.

I am very pleased to be here with Mr. Kennedy, Robert Kennedy, who is our friend and our candidate for the United States Senate, and a very distinguished public servant, one that we owe a great debt of gratitude to. (Applause)

And I can say with equal sincerity and depth of feeling what a rare privilege it is to be with this good Mayor of the City of New York, a long time friend. (Applause)

Now, let's get on. I am sure that Eddie and Averell know that I love them dearly, and I don't need to take any more of their time. They are such fine and great citizens.

Yes, sir?

Question. Senator, Senator Goldwater has made some rather controversial statements about the role of minorities in this country, once in Pennsylvania and once again in a different sense in California. Would you care to comment, please?

Senator Humphrey. Yes. I read what the Senator had to say -- Senator Goldwater -- and I must say that I made a response to this both in Cleveland and in Philadelphia and Newark. Senator Goldwater has made the word "minority" appear as if it were a mean or ugly word and which it is not. It is but a word that is used to indicate that there are many different groups of people in America, people of many origins, backgrounds, nationalities, ethnic groups, but they are all Americans.

Just as I reviewed today in part the Columbus Day parade, I saw people there of Italian extraction, but they are Americans of Italian extraction, Italian-Americans, and the minorities to which Mr. Goldwater referred in a rather demeaning and derogatory manner, those minorities make up the great majority of Americans.

They are like separate instruments in a great symphony of American life.

I like to compare our population in this nation of ours to a great symphony orchestra. You need many, many instruments, many musical instruments, to bring out the beauty of the music. It wouldn't be much

of an orchestra if they were all french horns or if they were all just violins or all tubas.

But you need the balance and the diversity and the variety and out of that begets a harmony, and I want to make it very clear that the Administration that I speak for and the Party that I am privileged at this moment to speak for believes in an America in which there is room for differences, in which there is a unity, but also a diversity.

We don't ask everybody to look alike, be alike, or think alike, or come from the same place, and very frankly, if Mr. Goldwater's views had prevailed as the law of the land when his grandfather sought entrance to this country, Mr. Goldwater couldn't be a candidate for President right now. (Applause)

Question. Senator Goldwater told many times that if and when he will be elected, he will send to Khrushchev an ultimatum for the captive nations, especially for the Hungarian people.

I ask you, sir, can you send a message to the Hungarian people on responsibility on the anniversary of the uprising of the Hungarian people against the communist tyranny, because the Hungarian people suffered from both tyrannies, from Stalin and from Hitler.

Senator Humphrey. First, my friend, ultimatums in this day and age of the nuclear bomb and nuclear power, ultimatums are not designed to aid the cause of justice or peace. It could precipitate a war, and it could be of great damage to the very people that we would love to help and protect and ultimately gain -- help them in their fight for freedom.

Diplomacy by ultimatum is reckless, irresponsible --

Question. That is right.

Senator Humphrey. -- and will not help anybody.

Now, what should we do? Well, the other day I noticed that the Holy Father, the Pope, went to -- had negotiations with the government in Hungary, the regime, not because the Catholic Church condones communism. To the contrary, it is one of the -- it is possibly the most effective enemy of the communist force in the world.

But the Pope negotiated with the purpose in mind of being able to help in the spiritual life of the people of Hungary, to maintain the Church for spiritual guidance to the people of Hungary.

Now, I mention this because some people say that when you talk to these communists, or these regimes, that somehow or other you show yourself to be soft on communism.

Not at all. What the Holy Father sought to do was

to help with the spiritual life of the people, not to condone communism, not to have relationships on a friendly basis with the communist regime, but to help the people in their spiritual life.

Now, what is our policy as a government? Our policy is to build bridges of contact with the people of these countries. Our policy is to aid in every way that we can through diplomacy, through pressures, through contacts, through individuals, through any force that we have outside of outright military force, to bring greater independence and ultimate freedom to the peoples of these captive nations.

I know that it isn't the easy answer, but, my friends, I don't think there are any easy answers, and I believe that what we are seeking to do is the right thing.

Question. Thank you very much. (Applause)

Question. I have two questions. First, is the economic and educational assistance to the satellite countries helpful to the communist government or to the people, and should such bridging, the building of bridges, be considered an objective in itself or just a means to obtain changes in the system of government and in the degree of dependence on the Soviet Union? That is the first question.

Senator Humphrey. Yes, sir.

As you know, I can now speak for my own public record. I have voted for and supported cultural exchanges, some economic assistance, particularly in the instance of food in a country such as Poland, and we did so in Yugoslavia and in other areas of the world. I feel that this assistance is basically helpful to the people, and let me say that the people of these countries, the peoples of these countries, do love the United States of America. There isn't any animosity, any hatred on the part of the people with our country, and it is right and proper that we keep in touch with these people. The gentleman here that is with me, Mr. Kennedy, when he was in Poland, he was loved by the people. They rose up as like a mighty army to welcome him. And why? Because he represented the United States; because he represented, may I say most respectfully, a wonderful country and a wonderful President in his beloved brother, and he represented himself.

Now, that example, it seems to me, tells us that we must keep in touch with these people. Now, we don't build bridges just to build bridges. We build bridges so that we have a way to travel, so that we can help people help themselves to greater freedom, to less dependence upon the Soviet Union, to more independence for themselves, to more freedom for themselves. And I think the policy that we are pursuing is sensible. (Applause)

Question. Second, the West Germans clamor for a revision of the Polish-German border on the Oder-Neisse Line endangers the peace of Europe. Do you feel, Senator, that the United States Government should recognize officially the Oder-Neisse frontier?

Senator Humphrey. That is a very difficult question for me to answer in my position, and the reason I say that is because that line is a part of many other areas of disagreement and, we would hope, ultimate solution in Central Europe. The Oder-Neisse Line is related to other factors in all of Central Europe that is under negotiation and under study. I have a feeling that our government has a very open mind on this matter, and I know, for example, that General De Gaulle in one of his statements some years ago openly recognized the Oder-Neisse Line as the line of demarcation, and we have close relationships with the French Republic, but I don't feel that as an individual in the position that I am now that I ought to speak definitively, authoritatively, on that subject except to say that it is part of the general consideration of a settlement that we hope some time to be able to obtain in Central Europe.

Question. Are you against revisionism?

Senator Humphrey. Sir?

Question. Which means war; again, revisionism which means war?

Senator Humphrey. Well, I have not been too sympathetic with the revisionists, may I say.

Question. Thank you. (Applause)

Question. Our readers are very anxious to find out your opinion, first of all, about the American policy on Cyprus and after that about the new immigration bill.

Senator Humphrey. Let me say first in reference to the American policy on Cyprus -- what we have sought to do is to maintain through negotiation the peace in the area because the bloodshed that has taken place has been very dangerous, both to the people on Cyprus and also to the alliance, the NATO alliance, and our policy is one, of course, of an independent Cyprus -- to support an independent Cyprus -- and to see if we can't work out through negotiation and diplomacy a reasonable settlement in Cyprus so that both the people of Turkish extraction and of Greek extraction can live in peace.

Now, how that is going to be done, sir, is not something that I can answer quickly. We have had men like Mr. Harriman working on it, Mr. Ball working on it, Mr. Acheson working on it, President Johnson working on it, but I can assure you that our desire is to maintain the peace of the area and in no way to sacrifice the people of the area, and we fully recognize that the Greek

people are the majority people in the island.

Question. You do, above all, recognize the right of self-determination.

Senator Humphrey. That is right. Of self-determination.

Question. The great majority of the Greek-American persons must press in this direction, if not --

Senator Humphrey. This government has always supported self-determination since the time of Woodrow Wilson which is the basic policy of this Government.

Now, may I answer your immigration question because we are getting right down now to legislative policy.

The gentleman that is here with me, Mr. Kennedy, as the Attorney General of the United States, speaking for two presidents, President Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson, sent to the Congress of the United States from the Executive Branch of the Government a revised immigration bill, a new immigration law, and that immigration bill was one, by the way, that had the support of the late John Kennedy when he was United States senator.

If I may just for a moment take your time, I was a co-sponsor with John Kennedy when he was in the United States Senate of an immigration bill very similar to the one that his brother, Robert Kennedy, as the Attorney General sent over to the Congress on behalf of President Kennedy and President Johnson.

So we feel that revision of the Immigration Act is absolutely essential. This Administration and the Democratic Party is committed to the bill that was sent to the Congress by John Kennedy as President of the United States through the Attorney General. The President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson, is committed to that bill. We think it is fair, and may I say we don't think that it opens up floodgates at all. What we do think is that it makes the gates that are open fair gates. We abolish the ethnic and racial discrimination features. We increase the amounts, the number of immigrants slightly. We permit family reunion. And my goodness, why not? We permit people of skills and competence that are needed in the American economy and the social structure to be given some priorities, and we abolish the old 1920-1952 system which discriminates against Eastern and Southern Europeans. (Applause)

Question. May I --

Senator Humphrey. Yes? Good to see you again.

Question. Thank you, sir.

Senator Humphrey. We almost had an interview out here on the avenue today.

Question. I work for Prenser. You know that.

I don't have to tell you. And we Puerto Ricans don't have to worry about the immigration law.

Senator Humphrey. No.

Question. But we are supporting, well, maybe Mr. Goldwater wants to get rid of us, too. That would be very difficult. (Laughter) But we are very much interested in helping our Spanish friends, I mean the Spaniards from Spain. We spoke to, shall I say, Senator Kennedy the other day, and he was very much interested, and I know you are, too, because you are working on the same thing. They get only a quota of 250 a year, and if this law is revised, will that mean that that quota will be increased?

Senator Humphrey. There will be -- indeed it would. There will be no quota as such based upon the 1920 census population. In fact, we pool -- one of the -- I believe I am correct in that, am I not, Robert, that we pool the unused quotas?

Mr. Kennedy. That is correct.

Senator Humphrey. So that where there were areas not used, other nations will be able to use those quotas so there will be a substantial increase in the number of people of Spanish extraction that will come.

Mr. Kennedy. All of the countries will be treated equally. It will be over a five year period of time. All countries will be treated equally.

Question. But I always hear Western Europe. I mean just don't speak about Eastern Europe or Southern Europe. I would like once in a while to hear Western Europe because that is where Spain is.

Senator Humphrey. Well --

Mr. Kennedy. From now on.

Senator Humphrey. I think we just talk about Eastern Europe but the bill treats all parts of Europe.

Question. All the people here, they all have representation. The poor Spaniards don't have anybody. So I am here --

Senator Humphrey. My dear, with you, with you such representation --

Question. Ole, ole.

Senator Humphrey. Marvelous.

Question. And I want to ask something about that, the Commission established in Puerto Rico -- you asked the question the other day and so did --

Senator Humphrey. Yes.

Question. -- Mr. Kennedy about the letting of people of Puerto Rico decide but I would like to know after the referendum, after the

Commission presents its report, what is going to be done by the Congress? Do you have any idea? The Commission --

Senator Humphrey. I will have to wait until I see what the report is of the Commission, what recommendations they make to the Congress, my dear.

Question. Thank you very much; thank you, Mr. Kennedy.

Question. Mr. Senator --

Senator Humphrey. May I just say, we are very, very pleased that the Puerto Ricans have such an effective representative and we like the Puerto Ricans.

Question. Thank you very much. We like you, too.

Senator Humphrey. Thank you, my dear.

Question. Mr. Senator, my name is Oslin, and I am from the Latvian Nationality Group.

Senator Humphrey. Yes.

Question. I would like to ask you a few questions and that is remind our memories, refresh our memories about during the period of the Second World War. When the Russians and the Nazi Germans signed an agreement and the secret pact about inclusion of the Baltic states in the Soviet Russian territory, about the partition of Poland, to take part away from Rumania, this Bessarabia, that time the President Roosevelt gave a statement through his Secretary of State, Mr. Stottinius, that he doesn't recognize the inclusion of the Baltic states in the Soviet Union and as far as I understand, still this recognition exists. But nevertheless, during the war, I think in 1945 or so, there was several statesmen and senators who expressed and agreed with Stalin at that time that the Soviet Union after the war needs a friendly government around the Soviet Union. That means Poland, all Eastern Europe, Baltic states; and at that time there were several senators and statesmen who said, "Yes, we agree. Stalin is right. The Soviet Union has a right to incorporate the Baltic states in the Soviet Union." Partition of Poland and so on.

Please, how could you explain now, does that kind of a code still exist or do you repudiate that or what is the present situation?

Senator Humphrey. Well, those were the views of individuals. Those were not the views of the Government of the United States.

Question. That is right.

Senator Humphrey. And the Government of the United States does not believe in sacrificing any people or any country for the accomodation of any other people or country. And believe me, we do not believe in the sacrifice of the independence of any nation state in order to

make it more convenient for somebody else as they -- according to their idea of convenience.

So to make it simple, we believe in an independent Poland. We still recognize the representatives of the Baltic states. And one of the greatest things that has happened to America is the large number of people from Latvia and Estonia and Lithuania that have come to the United States.

Question. So, Mr. Senator, so you don't agree for that incorporation, do you?

Senator Humphrey. No.

Question. You exist for independent states.

Senator Humphrey. I do.

Question. That is your present solution, reason.

Senator Humphrey. Yes, sir

Question. Thank you, very much. That is very important.

Question. Mr. Senator, what is the position of the government today towards Israel and especially to the threats of Nasser to annihilate Israel?

Senator Humphrey. Well, we have lived with those threats for a long time, my friend, and may I say that the position of the government of the United States towards Israel is for the protection of the territorial integrity under the Tripartite Agreements of 1950 backed up, may I say, by a strong commitment of the American people who have a great friendship for the State of Israel and for the people of Israel.

We seek above all, sir, to keep the peace in the Middle East. We think that peace in the Middle East is the only way that any of the people in the Middle East are going to be able to prosper and to thrive, and we think the example that the Israelis have given of developing a viable, effective, productive economy is one that stands very well in the world today for many other nations, and many other small nations in particular. And you can rest assured that this government is still committed unequivocally to the commitments that were made in 1950, that as far as the territorial integrity of the nation states in the Middle East is concerned, we are prepared to defend it. (Applause)

I think we will take one more here.

Question. One more before you leave, Senator.

Senator Humphrey. Yes.

Question. I am sorry. My question then is you

know we have got a hot senatorial race here in New York.

Senator Humphrey. Yes, sir. I have heard about that.

Question. And the Velacchi hearings have become quite a thing involved in the race, involving the alleged Italian voters supposed to be running against the Democratic candidate. What are your views on the Velacchi hearings?

Senator Humphrey. Well, let me say I have heard something about this, and it is really kind of surprising to me because first of all, the Velacchi hearings were conducted by a committee of the United States Senate, not by the Justice Department, and the committee that conducted them is the Permanent Investigating Committee of the United States Senate.

Now, I don't serve on that particular subcommittee. I know this, that when a subcommittee of the Senate that is established by law requires of a department of government information or a witness that is in the custody of the Government of the United States, that that committee or that department of government has an obligation to comply with the request of the committee. And I do believe if my memory serves me correctly that such a request was made of the Attorney General. He didn't initiate it. The request was answered and if he hadn't have, he would have had more trouble than he is having right now, I can tell you, because the Senate treats some of the cabinet officers with the kind of treatment that senators like to deal out to cabinet officers occasionally, and Mr. Kennedy was required by the rules of the Senate and the laws of the United States to produce a witness.

Now, it is just utterly ridiculous, may I say in all candor, and I am not being asked to defend anybody, but I read about this and I am not so openly involved in all of the local elections up here, but I am for Bob Kennedy. I want that crystal clear. And President Johnson is for him, too. (Applause)

I think it is really playing very loose with political truth and political honesty to try to fix the blame for anything that may have happened in the Velacchi hearings upon the former Attorney General of the United States. That just isn't right. Now, had he conducted that within the Department of Justice, on his own volition, then they can take him apart as they see fit. But there were several Senators on that subcommittee, and I think I recall a statement in the Senate at one time on the part of several of them relating to that hearing and one of them from my good friend here -- I believe Senator Javits of New York made some statements in reference to it. He said that he thought the hearings had been conducted well. I can't remember the exact words. But he was a member of the committee.

Now, if there was such complaint about those hearings, why wasn't the complaint made in the Senate? We have two senators from each state. I want to just say one other thing. Italian people never had a better friend in their lives than John Fitzgerald Kennedy and his brother. (Applause)

. Unless I can just crowd in a little bit myself. I think I am a pretty good friend, and I know that President Johnson is, and his number 1 aide in the White House is none other than Jack Valenti to stand along side of him every hour of the day, and I hope what I said here will be not misunderstood. I want to make it clear.

The Senate conducted that hearing. If there are any complaints about it, it should have been made in the Senate.

The Attorney General didn't conduct that hearing, and had he not have responded to the request of the Senate, he would have had more trouble than he is getting in the New York campaign, and I hope that somehow or another he can be treated fairly on this question.

Question. Senator, can you tell me how many electoral votes you predict in New York?

Senator Humphrey. I hope we will get them all.

Question. Can you predict how many?

Senator Humphrey. Well I -- we want them all.

Now, may I just conclude. If you will bear with me, I have a very heavy schedule ahead of me tonight. I have to get up into Connecticut and two meetings yet in New York. I want to conclude my remarks here by first thanking you for giving me this forum to visit with you. There are many subjects that we could have still covered. The foreign language press does a great service for the people of America, a great service and it does a great service, may I say, for people in other lands that want to know how we are thinking in America. And it does a great service to preserve some cultural and national identity. And we are deeply indebted to you. And I hope that you will keep that fight up on the immigration bill.

You help us and I guarantee you that President Johnson and Hubert Humphrey as Vice-President and Robert Kennedy as U.S. Senator -- we will get something done about it. (Applause)

#####



news release

FROM THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE PUBLICITY DIVISION 1730 K STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON 6, D.C. FEDERAL 3-8750

FOR A.M.'S RELEASE
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 13

B-3860

TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY
BY
SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY
DEMOCRATIC VICE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE
WESTCHESTER COUNTY DEMOCRATIC RALLY
MONDAY EVENING
OCTOBER 12, 1964

In Presidential campaigns it is traditional to look ahead to the next four years. But in 1964 this would be shortsighted indeed.

The problems which beset us in 1964 -- and our responses to them -- will shape America not just for the next four years, but far into the future.

This is not a time for failure of nerve. This is no time to begin demolishing our remarkable accomplishments of the past 30 years -- accomplishments which represent the consensus of both Democratic and Republican parties.

Yet what does Senator Goldwater propose? What are his plans for America? Listen to his own words:

"The government must begin to withdraw from a whole series of programs...from Social Welfare programs, education, public power, agriculture, public housing, urban renewal....I suggest that we establish by law, a rigid timetable for a staged withdrawal."

Or: "My aim is not to pass laws, but to repeal them."

Is this the time to begin tearing apart the better society we have struggled so long to build? And is this the time to ignore the challenge of building the Great Society?

America will not retreat -- we will not turn back -- we will not experience a failure of nerve.

-- more --

We surely cannot now ignore the challenge of making life more meaningful and pleasant in our metropolitan areas.

The traditional distinction between urban and rural life has disappeared. And the distinction between suburb and city is fast being eroded.

The growth of our population -- the change in the economy of our cities -- the growth of managerial and service occupations has created a new phenomenon called the urban complex -- the super city.

Every day you encounter and experience the problems of living in a super city -- problems of transportation, education, recreation, and even in Westchester, pockets of poverty.

We cannot allow the massive problems of the metropolis to remain unattended. These are not just Westchester problems or New York City problems. They are problems which affect every metropolitan area in the country. And, as a national concern, these problems require the cooperative efforts of Federal, state and local governments, working with private groups and individuals to develop effective solutions.

This cooperative assault on the problems of the exploding metropolis has been launched by the Congress under the Kennedy-Johnson Administration. It is a record we can be proud of: enactment of programs for mass transportation and open spaces in urban and suburban areas; expanded low rent public housing; increased Federal assistance for local planning; expanded housing for the elderly; a humanized urban renewal program; moderate income rental housing; increased housing starts; and a comprehensive anti-poverty program stressing local community action.

Yes, we have begun. But now we are confronted by a spirit of negation and reactionary nostalgia from the Goldwater faction. Their leader has opposed resolutely almost every positive proposal to improve the quality of life in our urban and suburban areas.

He voted against the mass transportation act.

He voted ~~against~~ against the program to acquire open spaces in urban and suburban areas.

He voted against the housing act of 1961.

He voted against legislation to help provide housing for the elderly in urban areas.

He voted against funds for urban renewal.

He voted against the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

By this record, the leader of the Goldwater faction has demonstrated his total lack of concern for the problems of our metropolitan areas. He has given specific documentation for his statement of September 30, 1961:

"Sometimes I think this country would be better off if we could just saw off the Eastern Seaboard and let it float out to sea."

Second, the urban complex faces the problem of public education.

Our children are the future of this country. They need and deserve the best education we can provide. It is our responsibility. A first-rate public system of education is the bedrock of democracy.

Here is the record of the Kennedy-Johnson Administration: we have provided more college classrooms, we have improved programs for vocational education, we have increased loans to needy college students, we have supported a substantial increase in public library facilities.

Senator Goldwater, however, has seldom missed an opportunity to express his lack of concern for American education.

He voted against the National Defense Education Act and subsequent amendments.

He voted against the School Construction Act of 1960.

He voted against the School Assistance Act of 1961.

He voted against the work-study and vocational education programs of 1963.

He voted against aid for colleges and universities in 1963.

He voted against the medical education act of 1963.

But these votes are expected from a man who could tell the citizens of Jacksonville, Florida: "The government has no right to educate children....The child has no right to an education. In most cases, the children will get along very well without it."

None of his votes on education, it should be added, reflect official Republican policy. Senator Goldwater's attitude, in fact, repudiates a Republican tradition which goes back to the Land Grant Act of 1862. Had he been in the Senate then, Goldwater would probably have denounced Abraham Lincoln as a "socialist."

Senator Goldwater has not limited his program for dismantling the social accomplishments of the past to the areas of metropolitan life or education. By no means. He has consistently opposed responsible governmental programs in a variety of areas -- even those proposed by his own Republican Party.

- more -

I have analyzed the votes of Senator Goldwater on 25 specific positions set forth in the 1960 Republican Platform as compared with the votes of Senators Dirksen, Kuchel, Saltonstall, and Hickenlooper.

An honest appraisal of what Republicanism means is found in this 1960 platform. It was a conservative platform--but it was a responsible platform too. It reflected the fact that a Republican Administration had been in office eight years, and had dealt with the complex problems of a great nation in a turbulent world.

The record shows that Senator Kuchel supported his party's declared position on every one of these 25 major issues. And Senator Saltonstall supported the platform on 20 occasions.

But what about Senator Dirksen and Senator Hickenlooper?

They come from the Midwest; they are deeply committed to the tradition of the Republican Party; and they are universally and rightly known as solid conservatives.

Senator Dirksen voted for the Party's platform 18 times, and went against it only four times.

Senator Hickenlooper voted 17 times for his party's platform, and went against it only 3 times.

In short, Senator Dirksen, Senator Hickenlooper, Senator Saltonstall, and Senator Kuchel--all supported the 1960 Republican Platform an overwhelming majority of the time.

But not Senator Goldwater. He opposed the party platform all 25 times when these major issues came before the Senate for a vote. Always the same refrain: "No, no, ... a thousand times no!"

So I came to the conclusion that Senator Goldwater is neither Republican nor conservative. He is a radical and he is a Goldwaterite. And radical Goldwaterism simply does not equate with conservative Republicanism.

Fortunately, the American people have a choice on November 3rd. But what we vote for is far more important than what we vote against.

Yes, we shall reject all that is retrograde and reactionary in American life. But we shall also reaffirm what is constructive and forward-looking.

(more)

HUMPHREY/ constructive and forward looking.

page 6

Recognizing that America has great problems, we shall affirm that it has great opportunities.

Remembering that it has a glorious past, we shall affirm that it has an even more glorious future.

President Johnson has asked us to join with him in building the Great Society. He faces these challenges with courage, determination, responsibility and confidence. He believes in America. He believes in her people. And he believes this nation wants to continue moving forward.

I believe the American people share this vision of a better tomorrow--this vision of the Great Society. I believe the American people will say "Yes" to Lyndon B. Johnson on election day.

#####

Westchester

Bill Luddy Bob Kennedy
26th Frank Conroy Cong
26th Dick Ottinger

In Presidential campaigns it is traditional to

look ahead to the next four years. But in 1964 this

would be shortsighted indeed.

Tomorrow's
and now!

The problems which beset us in 1964--~~and our~~

~~responses to them~~--will shape America not just for

the next four years, but far into the future.

This is not time for a failure of nerve. This

is no time to begin demolishing our remarkable

accomplishments of the past 30 years--accomplishments

which represent the consensus of both Democratic and

Republican parties.

Yet what does Senator Goldwater propose? What

are his plans for America? Listen to his own words:

Goldwater
Plans

"The government must begin to withdraw from a
whole series of programs...from social welfare

all
shape
the
future

1964
Problems
and
Answers!

✓ "programs, education, public power, agriculture
public housing, urban renewal...I suggest that
we establish by law, a rigid timetable for a
staged withdrawal."

Repeal
our
Achievements

ⓧ Or: "My aim is not to pass laws, but to repeal them." ⓧ

Is this the time to begin tearing apart the
better society we have struggled so long to build?
And is this the time to ignore the challenge of building
the Great Society?

Study
American history
Dedicate
for it

America will not retreat--we will not turn back--

~~We will not experience a failure of nerve.~~

We surely cannot now afford to ignore the challenge
of making life more meaningful and pleasant in our
metropolitan areas.

urban
life

The traditional distinction between urban and
rural life has disappeared. And the distinction between

suburb and city is fast being eroded.

The growth of our population--the change in the
economy of our cities--the growth of managerial and
services occupations has created a new phenomenon called
the urban complex--the super city.

Every day you encounter and experience the problems
of living in a super city--problems of transportation,
education, recreation, and, even in Westchester, pockets
of poverty.

We cannot allow the massive problems of the metropolis
to remain unattended. These are not just Westchester
problems or New York City problems. They are problems
which affect every metropolitan area in the country.

And, as a national concern, these problems require the
cooperative efforts of Federal, state and local governments

Bob
Kennedy

working with private groups and individuals to develop effective solutions.

This cooperative assault on the problems of the exploding metropolis has been launched by the Congress under the Kennedy-Johnson Administration. It is a record we can be proud of: enactment of programs for mass transportation and open spaces in urban and suburban areas; expanded low rent public housing; increased Federal assistance for local planning; expanded housing for the elderly; a humanized urban renewal program; moderate income rental housing; increased housing starts; and a comprehensive ^{economic opportunities} ~~anti-poverty~~ program stressing local community action.

Yes, we have begun. But now we are confronted by a spirit of negation and reactionary nostalgia from the

Goldwater faction. Their leader has opposed resolutely
almost every positive proposal to improve the quality of
life in our urban and suburban areas.

He voted against the mass transportation act.

He voted against the program to acquire open spaces
in urban and suburban areas.

He voted against the housing act of 1961.

He voted against legislation to help provide housing
for the elderly in urban areas.

He voted against funds for urban renewal.

He voted against the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

By this record, the leader of the Goldwater faction
has demonstrated his total lack of concern for the problems
of our metropolitan areas. He has given specific

Sen Haldwater no friend of Metropolitan East
- 6 -

~~documentation for his statement of September 30, 1961:~~

OK "Sometimes I think this country would be better off
if we could just saw off the Eastern Seaboard and let
it float out to sea."

second, the urban complex faces the problem of
public education. - Education

Our children are the future of this country.
They need and deserve the best education we can provide.

It is our responsibility. A first-rate public system
of education is the bedrock of democracy.

X
X
Here is the record of the Kennedy-Johnson administra-
tion: we have provided more college classrooms, we have
improved programs for vocational education, we have
increased loans to needy college students, we have supported
a substantial increase in public library facilities.

Senator Goldwater, however, has seldom missed an opportunity to express his lack of concern for American education.

He voted against the National Defense Education Act and subsequent amendments.

He voted against the School Construction Act of 1960.

He voted against the School Assistance Act of 1961.

He voted against the work-study and vocational education programs of 1963.

He voted against aid for colleges and universities in 1963.

He voted against the medical education act of 1963.

But these votes are ~~not~~ expected from a

man who could tell

~~public officials who~~ the citizens of Jacksonville,

Education

- 8 -

Florida: "The Government has no right to educate children....

The child has no right to an education. In most cases,

the children will get along very well without it."

None of his votes on education, it should be added, reflect official Republican policy. Senator Goldwater's attitude, ~~in fact~~, repudiates a Republican tradition which goes back to the Land Grant Act of 1862. Had he been in the Senate then, Goldwater would probably have denounced Abraham Lincoln as a "socialist."

Senator Goldwater has not limited his program for dismantling the social accomplishments of the past to the areas of metropolitan life or education. By no means. He has consistently opposed responsible governmental programs in a variety of areas--even those proposed by his own Republican Party.

I have analyzed the votes of Senator Goldwater on
25 specific positions set forth in the 1960 Republican
Platform as compared with the votes of Senators Dirksen,
Kuchel, Saltonstall, and Hickenlooper. *Senate Rep. Leady*

~~An honest appraisal of what Republicanism means is~~
~~found in the~~ 1960 platform. ~~It~~ was a conservative
platform--but it was a responsible platform too. It
reflected the fact that a Republican Administration had
been in office eight years, and had dealt with the complex
problems of a great nation in a turbulent world.

The record shows that Senator Kuchel supported his
party's declared position on every one of these 25 major
issues. And Senator Saltonstall supported the platform
on 20 occasions.

*Kuchel a Extremist
Saltonstall an Easterner*

But what about Senator Dirksen and Senator Hickenlooper?

They come from the Midwest; they are deeply committed

to the tradition of the Republican Party; and they are universally and rightly known as solid conservatives.

Senator Dirksen voted for the Party's platform 18 times, and went against it only four times.

Senator Hickenlooper voted 17 times for his party's platform, and went against it only 8 times.

In short, Senator Dirksen, Senator Hickenlooper, Senator Saltonstall, and Senator Kuchel--all supported the 1960 Republican Platform an overwhelming majority of the time.

But not Senator Goldwater. He opposed the party platform all 25 times when these major issues came before

the Senate for a vote. Always the same refrain: "No,
no,...a thousand times no!"

So I come to the conclusion that Senator Goldwater
is neither Republican nor conservative. He is a radical --
and radical Goldwaterism simply does not equate with
~~mean responsible~~ ~~conservative~~ Republicanism.

Goldwater a good man
but not my President

Fortunately, the American people have a choice on
November 3rd. But what we vote for is far more important
than what we vote against.

Yes, we shall reject all that is retrograde and
reactionary in American life. But we shall also reaffirm
what is constructive and forward-looking.

We vote for continued Prosperity
In the future, ~~For Peace~~
Vote for Unity. Vote for Peace
Vote for Progress. Peace is Progress

Recognizing that America has great problems, we shall affirm that it has great opportunities.

Remembering that it has a glorious past, we shall affirm that it has an even more glorious future.

President Johnson has asked us to join with him in building the Great Society. He faces these challenges with courage, determination, responsibility and confidence. He believes in America. He believes in her people. And he believes this nation wants to continue moving forward.

I believe the American people share this vision of a better tomorrow--this vision of the Great Society. I believe the American people will say "Yes" to Lyndon B. Johnson on election day.

Remarks of Senator Humbert H. Humphrey
at Westchester County Center, New York
October 12, 1964

Senator Humphrey. Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Bill Liddy, for your generous and gracious introduction, and may I thank this wonderful audience in Westchester for this great reception, a wonderful reception to Mrs. Humphrey and myself and a tumultuous reception to the next United States Senator from New York, Bob Kennedy.

(Applause.)

I am delighted to share this platform tonight with two of the new Congressmen that will serve this area in the House of Representatives, particularly -- wait for their names, now -- for Frank Caniff --

(Applause.)

And Dick Ottinger.

(Applause.)

Apparently somebody thinks that I need to add a few more inches to my height.

(Laughter.)

I want to thank them. I thought I had grown up but apparently not.

Tonight is a wonderful, wonderful evening for the future of our country. I come to one of the most important counties, one of the most important areas of the United States.

(Applause.)

And I come here for a very, very good and worthy purpose.

I come here to cite the record of the Kennedy-Johnson Administration and to ask your support for the man that I am sure with your help will be the President of the United States for the next four years, Lyndon Johnson.

(Applause.)

I also come here, in the words of my wife, to ask you to support the whole ticket from top to bottom and from bottom

to top.

(Applause.)

I am delighted to have the privilege of meeting the splendid county committee, the candidates for public office in the Westchester area, and as I have stated, to ask you not only to support your President, not only to support the man that seeks the office of Vice-President, not only to ask you to support your local candidates but to back your President and to back that program by giving the President in the Congress the kind of stalwarts, the kind of courageous and able men that he needs, and I have three upon this platform, Robert Kennedy, Frank Caniff and Dick Ottinger.

(Applause.)

Let me say just a word or two here in opening my remarks, about the gentleman that spoke to you just a few moments ago, Bob Kennedy.

Senator Kennedy -- I want to get used to calling you that -- and by the way --

(Applause.)

I insist that you make him Senator Kennedy because when Lyndon Johnson wins, that means that I get to be Vice President and that means that I can swear in Bob Kennedy as United States Senator.

(Applause.)

Bob Kennedy is honored tonight as few men in public life are ever privileged to be honored. He is honored every day, every day that I have been with him, and his illustrious and great brother before him and his younger brother who is a dear and personal friend of mine--

(Applause)

The honor that I speak of is one that every parent, every person of voting age in this State ought to be fully aware of and most appreciative of.

I have yet to find a man in public life that has the support, that has the trust, that has the enthusiastic affection

and admiration of the young people like Bob Kennedy has.

(Applause.)

Now let me say a word to these young people. Let me speak just a word to our young friends. I personally greatly enjoy the fellowship and the friendship of these young people.

As I travel around the country, it has been noted and written that a number of the young people attend our meetings.

Now, some people make light of this. Others even scorn it. Some say, Oh, all you have are the bobby soxers or all you have are the Beetle lovers, and some of these others.

But let me tell you what you have. First of all, I want to say to the young people anybody that speaks disparagingly of you and your participation in the political life of America, that kind of a person is unworthy of the trust and of the support of your parents, and you see to it that they remember it.

(Applause.)

I don't know what greater honor could be paid a person than to be loved and respected by the youth. The bible speaks of it, the prophets speak of it, the philosophers speak of it, and yet I notice that when someone has that affection there is always a cynic, there is always someone that turns a phrase and makes it appear as if all you have are the youngsters.

Well, let me say right now that if I have my choice between some of the cynical oldsters that support the old, old, old Goldwater line --

(Applause.)

--or can't make up their minds who they support, and those who know who they are for and what they are for, let me say right now I enlist with the young people of America for a better future of America.

(Applause.)

Now let me say to my young friends your job is cut out for you. For those that laugh at you, for those that make fun of you, all you need to do is make yourself individually committees of one to go home and advise your voting age brothers and

sisters, your mother and your father, your grandfather and your grandmother, your neighbors, advise them about the election.

They have been advising you for years. It is now your turn.

(Applause.)

And may I as an old friend just pass along a suggestion. The best advice that I can give to you, which I hope you will pass along to the family, is to vote for President Johnson, Humbert Humphrey, Robert Kennedy, Frank Caniff and Dick Ottinger.

(Applause.)

Bob Kennedy has spoken of the years, those one thousand dramatic days, of the leadership of our late beloved President. He has spoken of those days since November 22, 1963, when we had amazing, competent, able, effective leadership from President Lyndon Johnson.

I want to testify tonight that this leadership not only had the support and the help of members of Congress, and I was very fortunate to be included in that selected group or select group of Congressional leaders permitted to meet with our President Kennedy and our President Johnson, but this Senator can testify as witness to the fact that the great programs of education, the programs of immigration legislation, the programs of housing, the programs that relate to our cities, mass transit, the programs of civil rights, the program of the Peace Corps, the programs of health that put America forward, and as John Kennedy said, got America moving again, that those programs had the help and the advice and the counsel and the support and the enthusiastic backing of the man who ought to be the United States Senator from New York, Bob Kennedy.

(Applause.)

I say this because I know what happened and when I hear some people say, well, I wonder whether or not Robert Kennedy will help us in housing, or whether or not he played an important role in civil rights, or where was he when the Peace Corps was being designed and passed, I can tell you where he was.

He was in the thick of the fight and he was there.

(Applause.)

So, I come here in New York, at Westchester County, to tell you that there is a team in the field and it is a team that needs your support and I believe it is a team that has earned your support, and it is the team of Johnson, Humphrey, and Kennedy.

(Applause.)

Now, my friends, you know, ordinarily in every Presidential election year somebody either wants you to look back at what we have been doing or occasionally somebody says let's look ahead two or three years.

In this election year, my fellow Americans, it is not enough to look ahead four years. Time moves on rapidly.

Last night Mrs. Humphrey and I were privileged to attend a dinner in Washington, D. C., the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial dinner, and tonight when we leave this building --

(Applause.)

Senator Kennedy, Bob Kennedy, will go to a dinner honoring the memory of Mrs. Roosevelt in the City of New York.

(Applause.)

Last evening Adlai Stevenson reminded us --

(Applause.)

--of the fine book or writings of Mrs. Roosevelt, and I wonder how many of the audience recall the title, because the title of that book is the message of this election year, and I think it poses the question and the answer in a few words.

The title of Mrs. Roosevelt's book of writings is "Tomorrow is Now."

(Applause.)

Tomorrow is Now. This is a simple and yet profound way of saying that this world of ours is changing so rapidly, that matters are changing so much both at home and abroad, that if all you are going to do is to stop and think about the problems of today, you have already missed the tomorrows.

You must think ahead. You must plan ahead. You cannot afford the luxury or the extravagance of thinking only of the yesterdays.

Nor can you have the luxury and the extravagance of only praising yourselves for the accomplishments of today.

That is why I say this election is more than looking ahead four years because four years will go by like that, and in four years, whole new worlds can be created and discovered or old worlds destroyed.

What we need to be thinking about is the fact that in this election we will fashion the shape of our society and indeed we may very well fashion the future of the world for decades to come and that is why we need your help.

(Applause.)

Now, if that is true, surely this is no time, my friends, to talk about demolishing that which we have accomplished over some 30 years.

Surely this is no time to ask America to look backwards and repeal the yesterdays, and yet what does the leader, what does the temporary spokesman of a fraction of a faction of the Republican Party propose --

(Laughter and applause.)

Let me ask you to listen to his own words. They are incredible. They are unbelievable. But this is what he said.

(Laughter.) (Applause.)

I take this man at his word even when he changes his word.

(Laughter. (Applause.)

Listen to the words of the man that says he wants to be President.

"The Government must begin to withdraw from a whole series of programs, from social welfare programs, education, public power, agriculture, public housing, urban renewal. I suggest that we establish by law a rigid timetable for a staged withdrawal."

Here is a man that wouldnd't only repeal the 20th century. He wants to go back to the Articles of Confederation.

(Applause.)

This gentleman goes further. He says: "My aim is not to pass laws. It is to repeal them."

(Laughter.)

And I think that every person in this audience ought to say seriously, what laws?

Well, he has spoken with some doubt about social security. I don't say he wants to repeal it but he is suggesting that he wants to repeal laws.

Minimum wage -- he hasn't voted for it. It is entirely probable that he would like to preal it.

Housing -- he says get out of it.

Education -- oh, no, none of that.

(Laughter.) (Applause.)

Now, my friends, it is having to have a man standing for public office that reminds us of the glories of yesterday, but I would suggest that if he is going to do it, he study history and report accurately.

(Applause.)

And may I also say most respecyfully to the students that are here, and to those who are of voting age and college students --

(Applause.)

--that it is having, my enthusiastic young friends, to study ancient history, but for goodness sakes, don't let your parents vote for it.

(Applause.) (Laughter.)

I think it is about time that both candidates for the Presidency clearly understood that the rural life of America

has changed and that a metropolitan era is upon us.

Now, one understands that, the man who is President. He knows that America is growing. He knows that America is becoming more and more urbanized. He knows that American cities are becoming more and more industrialized.

But the gentleman from Arizona is still back at the covered wagon staking out homesteads.

(Applause.)

The growth of our population, the changes in technology, industry, the change in the economy of our cities, has created a new phenomenon called the urban complex or the super city, and I believe that it is time that people in public office discuss the problems of cities.

They are here. They are not getting smaller. They are getting bigger. And I have a feeling that they are even going to last longer than Barry Goldwater, so maybe we had better go to work on them.

(Applause.)

Robert Kennedy spoke to you of them. He told you of the problems of transportation, of education, of recreation, and all of these problems are here in this great empire State of New York just as they are in every other major State in the Union.

Our country is growing. And it is going to continue to grow and it is growing younger, not older. The percentage of population under age 25 increases ever year.

The need for new home units increases. The need for recreation, the need for educational facilities and teachers, every one of these great needs expand and increase, and these are not just the problems of Westchester.

Even in this great community, known for its wealth, known for its cultural attainment, even here you have problems of poverty, problems of low income, and these problems are a part of the great modern America, and we need people who seek public office that at least are aware of the problem and then once they have an awareness of it, start to propose solutions to the problems.

But what are we getting? We are getting lectures on the moral tone of America.

I wonder if the spokesman of the new Goldwater morality has ever thought that morality also includes being concerned about the poor, being concerned about the unfortunate, being concerned about the ill-clad, the ill-housed, and the sick.

I wonder if we have forgotten that we have some social and moral obligation to the illiterate, to the hungry, to the naked, to the sick, to the blind. I hope we haven't.

(Applause.)

These problems remain with us and everyone of these problems offers a challenge and everyone of these challenges offers an opportunity, and this is why there are literally thousands of our young men and women studying in the great universities to equip themselves to meet these problems, studying nursing, medicine, engineering, studying to be a doctor, studying to be a social worker, studying to be an architect, or a city planner, and I think we need from people who seek the highest office of this land an expression of their concern and their interest in those who seek to come to grips with the problems of tomorrow because tomorrow is now.

(Applause.)

I am happy to say that those of us on this platform speaking for the Democratic Party tonight and those, by the way, in this audience who have put their country above Party, and there are many, that we can point to a record.

President Kennedy, when he spoke to the nation on January 20, 1961, asked this nation to begin, to begin to do things for people, to begin social progress, to begin to expand our economy, to begin to pursue peace, and the beginnings were made.

And those beginnings were not just words. They were programs, programs that have been mentioned from this platform tonight, programs with which Hubert Humphrey and Bob Kennedy had something to do and helped do it.

(Applause.)

We did pass a program for mass transportation, for open

spaces in urban areas, in suburban areas, for low rent public housing, for increased federal assistance for local planning, for expanded housing for the elderly and for our college students in their dormitories, for increased housing starts, for middle income, and a comprehensive Economic Opportunity Act to strike body blows at the poverty areas of America.

That is a record of accomplishment.

(Applause.)

And now what is the record of the voice of the past?
Let's take a look.

The man who says follow me -- right back into the 19th century -- what is his record?

He voted against mass transportation; against the open spaces, against the housing, against the urban renewal programs, against housing for the elderly, against the Economic Opportunity Act.

You name it.

And I can assure you of one thing, that if you are a betting person, if you will bet he voted no, you will win 99 times out of a hundred.

(Applause.)

But my friends of the eastern seaboard, don't be too upset. You shouldn't have even been surprised, if you were, because this is the gentleman who said when interviewed about his attitude toward this great section of America, this great section of pioneer America, early America, here is what he said:

"Sometimes I think this country would be better off if we could just saw off the eastern seaboard and let it float out to sea."

(Laughter.)

These are the words of a man that asks you to vote for him for President, the Senator from Arizona.

What an easy way to solve problems -- just saw it off.

(Laughter.) (Applause.)

But may I suggest that the Party that has been at sea and apparently is lost without a compass or any sense of navigation is the man that made the statement that I just quoted.

(Applause.)

Now a word about the subject of education which has been discussed here this evening.

Imagine, my friends, placing the trust of this country, the responsibility of this country, in the hands of an individual who says, "The government has no right to educate children and the child has no right to an education. In most cases the children would get along very well without it."

What kind of an attitude is this? Are these the words of a person you want to be your President?

(Chorus of no from audience.)

Well, thank goodness I'm talking to educated people.

But might I add that this response is not just what you would expect from a Democratic audience. It is the response that you would receive from any responsible citizen because Senator Goldwater's attitude that I have read, not paraphrased but read word-for-word, these attitudes repudiate a Republican tradition in the field of education which has gone back to the Land-Grant Act of 1862.

I think that had Senator Goldwater been in the Senate in 1862, I mean physically -- he has been there somewhat psychologically --

(Applause.)) (Laughter.)

--I really believe that the Senator would have probably denounced Abraham Lincoln as a Socialist.

(Applause.)

It is an interesting exercise in the study of a political record to take a note of how close Senator Goldwater adheres to the traditional Republican line.

I have analyzed 25 votes on 25 specific issues of the Republican platform of 1960. That was the platform that was an

authentic conservative Republican platform. It was the platform that came of an Administration that had to deal with the tough problems of the turbulent post-war years. Eight years of administrative responsibility.

That 1960 platform therefore stands up as a reasonable, responsible, conservative Republican document.

Now, what is the record of Mr. Goldwater relating to that. And maybe this tells us why one out of every three registered Republicans says today that he is going to vote for Lyndon Johnson.

(Applause.)

On 25 Republican platform commitments, 25 times they were brought up in the Senate and Mr. Goldwater has a remarkable batting average. 25 times he fanned out. 25 times he voted no.

Now, there were others in the Senate of Republican persuasion, like Senator Dirksen, the leader, Senator Kuchel, the Whip, Senator Saltonstall, the conference chairman, Senator Hickenlooper, the policy committee chairman, elected Republican leaders.

Senator Kuchel voted 25 times for the platform. Of course, Mr. Goldwater dismisses him as an extremist.

(Laughter.)

Senator Saltonstall voted 20 times. He is dismissed as an easterner.

How about those two from the midwest? Senator Dirksen -- you can't call him an easterner and you surely wouldn't call him an extremist. I would say that he is a rather responsible conservative.

Senator Dirksen voted for his Party platform 18 times, seven times against it.

Senator Hickenlooper voted 17 times for his Party platform and eight times against it.

At least these men had better than a two-thirds voting record for their Party. They are Republicans.

But Mr. Goldwater voted 25 times against the commitments of his own Party on 25 major issues.

(Applause.)

So we come to but one conclusion. Senator Goldwater is surely not a Democrat.

(Laughter.)

Senator Goldwater, having repudiated his own Party 25 times on 25 platforms, surely is not a Republican. He can only live under one label. He is a radical, a Goldwater radical.

(Applause.)

And Goldwater radicalism is not responsible Republicanism, and therefore we see today why some of the leading figures of the Republican Party either hide out when Mr. Goldwater comes to town --

(Laughter.)

--or they sign up and say they are going to vote for Lyndon Johnson.

(Applause.)

My friends, lest I seem to be too personal, let me make it crystal clear that I think Mr. Goldwater is a patriot. I think that he is a fine gentleman. I think that he would make a good neighbor, but I don't want him for our President.

(Applause.)

What America needs and what America has and what America can continue to have is a President that looks to the future, a President that is equipped by background, training and experience for the job of leadership, a President that unites our country rather than divides it, a President that lifts the hopes of our people rather than darkens them, a President that asks us to do better rather than scolding us for having done so badly, a President, if you please, that calls from us the very best that is in us rather than chastising us as if somehow or another we are unruly children.

I submit to you that you have that President and you

have a President that asks you to work with him to plan the future.

You have a President that is responsible in the defense of this country and in the conduct of foreign policy.

You have a President that understands that today is the beginning of tomorrow and that tomorrow is now, and I suggest that you take that President to your hearts.

I suggest that you do for him what you did, so many of you, for John Kennedy, that you back him with your hands and your hearts and that you elect him President of the United States on November 3rd.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

melo end



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