

TRANSCRIPT

Presbyterian - National Staff of the Bd. of National Missions
September 12, 1967 Washington, D. C.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Thank you very much. Dr. Waterm^ualder and Dr. Nye^{neigh}, and the members of the National Staff of the Board of National Missions and the United Presbyterian Church.

I think first of all I should qualify myself for this assignment. It has been rumored to you that I wasn't in the best of fettle today. I never like to admit that. I have been proud of the fact that I have been in Washington almost twenty years and with the exception of one little two and a half day stint at the hospital for some very minor sugery, I never missed a morning or an afternoon of work. But I took a trip out West this weekend and three members of my staff that traveled with me--or two members of my staff--and myself, we all came down last night with what they call the good old-fashioned grippe and stomach flu, and if you don't think I felt miserable this morning.

I wanted to come, however, so much today that I prevailed upon my doctor, who said, "You go on home and stay in bed and quit this monkeying around," that I told Mr. Welch^S of my office that if it was agreeable I'd come here and do the best that I could. I wouldn't try to make any major speech, but would attempt to try to answer some of your questions.

Now I can qualify somewhat for a Presbyterian meeting. I married a Presbyterian girl, and I was married in the Presbyterian Church at Huron, South Dakota by Dr. Katell. Some of you may remember that name--a wonderful Minister. I attend, at Waverly Minnesota, the Union Presbyterian Church. Reverend Hempel is our Pastor out there. So at

least I have a few credentials.

Now I want you to know this only shows that the influence of my wife, because I was brought up a Methodist, and I compromised with her a little bit later on when we lived out in Southeast Minneapolis, and I said, "Well, dear, I guess we are sort of ecumenical. You can't have it all your way. And Reverend Gregory is my friend and he is over at the First Congregational Church, and we're just plain going to go over there."

But, having taught at a Presbyterian college, now speaking to-- is this the 41st? Is that what you said--the 41st annual meeting of your-- at least of this particular group, of the National Staff of the Board of National Missions. Maybe I can be of a little help to you today on some of the concerns that you have in mind.

The role of government in all of our economic and social life is of critical importance. It isn't quite as important as some people attribute to it, and yet it is a little more important than some people are willing to have it be. The concept of government that I see as a workable concept in our country is a partnership relationship between government and the voluntary private groups. There has been a term in the area of public administration known as creative federalism. That doesn't send anybody particularly when you hear it. But what it represents is sharing of responsibility and power and authority between the different levels of government in this country. I am in a sense a refugee from a classroom. My training was in the field of political science, and

particularly in American government, where I taught at McAllister College in the University of Minnesota. Many people identify this word government with the federal government. I think this would be sort of short-changing ourself on the truth. The government that affects your lives very directly day in and day out is not only the federal government, but in more specific and detailed terms, local government and state government. So when I speak of government, I want to have you keep in mind that I am talking about the total structure of our federal system.

Now, creative federalism requires that the different levels of government work in cooperation and coordination. The biggest task in this government today, all levels of government, is coordination. I sometimes have said, and I repeat it here, that department heads are extremely competent in the performance of their duties, are right jealous of their jurisdiction and their prerogatives and their programs. And it is possible in federal, state and local government for those department heads to feel as if they are independent members of the United Nations, exercising a type of sovereignty. The task, therefore, of governmental leadership today, at the Presidential, Vice Presidential, gubernatorial, mayor level, is to get these programatic departments synthesized, harmonized, synchronized, so that the resources which are in these programs and in these departments, can be brought to bear at any particular time upon a particular target.

Now that is a lot easier to say than to do. The most difficult task in the world is to coordinate the vast machinery and program of

government. It is easy to talk about, difficult to accomplish.

I mention this because repeatedly people are talking about duplication, lack of coordination, the failure of the government to respond promptly to public need. You need to keep in mind that these institutions are operated by men and women, that they live and operate within severe and strict legislative legal limitations, and that each person that operates a department basically seeks to do a good job for that department, and when you sit around and try to coordinate, as has been my task on a number of occasions, it is not the easiest or the most pleasant of assignments.

Let me give you an example of what I speak of. I happen to be Chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council. On that Council, the purpose of that Council is to coordinate all of the activities of this government in the field of aeronautics and space, development and research, exploration. On that Council sit some of the most important men of this government--Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, Secretary of Commerce, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the President's Science Advisor, the Director of NASA--the National Aeronautics and Space Agency--and we call in from time to time members from the Smithsonian Institution and the United States Information Agency and others. And to try to get a program that is on the same wave length with all of these departments, working for the same objectives, is a very difficult assignment. But we are learning how to use more and more the

counsel approach. I happen to be, as Vice President of the United States, Chairman of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Council, that coordinates all of the activity of this government in the field of marine sciences, oceanography, exploration of the oceans, the depths of the ocean, the floor of the ocean, marine biology, marine medicine, marine environmental research, the exploration for fuels and minerals, and, of course, national security and national defense.

Only recently the President asked me to Chair and to serve as the Chairman of the President's Youth Opportunity Council, wherein we try to integrate and coordinate the many programs that this government has at the federal level that relate to our youth, and I am happy to report to you that in our third year of experience, the first two years on a rather ad hoc basis, this year on a more formalized basis, operating under Executive Order, we think we have made some progress. We were able to help stimulate in the private economy and in government, over a million, four hundred thousand jobs for needy youth this last summer, needy youth, that is, the poor, the deprived. We were able to stimulate the activation of literally thousands of playgrounds that never before had existed. We had a very large cultural enrichment, education, recreation program going across this country. We had more boys and girls in camp this year than in any two years. We tried, in other words, to maximize the utilization of our resources and personnel without a large expenditure of money. And we were able to make some progress.

Now I have been rather restrained. I said that we have been able to make some progress. And I want to clear the decks now. We haven't found the answers to our problems, and our problems are many, and they are very intricate and complex.

The most important thing, it seems to me is are you making progress, are you moving in the right direction. There will always be people that are impatient and I'm one of the most impatient of the impatient. There will always be people that think we ought to do more and we need those people because there are so many that think we ought to do less. I have frequently been accused in the Nation's Capital of being a perennial congenital optimist. And I have replied in jest, in good humor I hope, that the reason that I am that way is there are so few competitors in that field, and so many over on the pessimistic side. I have staked out an area for myself that is relatively uninhabited.

This is a city in which people love to speak about problems and difficulties. I would like to speak about challenges and opportunities. Every single problem offers a challenge, and every difficulty offers an opportunity.

Now let's just take a good look at where we are. There are some people that feel today that we ought to concentrate all of our attention, if not all of it most of our attention in the domestic scene. And I can well understand that because we have plenty of things to do at home. Then we have others who feel that we are doing too much on the domestic scene as

a government and that the role of government is essentially in national security and foreign policy and we ought to really concentrate our attention in those areas.

What we seek to do is what the President said in his State of the Union address this last year, to strike some kind of a balance. He said that this nation is strong enough, it is rich enough, and its people are strong enough to fulfill our commitments abroad as well as to pursue the objectives of the Great Society at home.

Now I read in the morning Wall Street Journal about that where they have criticized me quite explicitly for having once again reiterated the President's statement. I said that there were some people in Washington that were tired people, and there are, tired of facing up to the tough issues of the day. And I pointed out that I didn't know any kind of Geritol that was really going to help them much. What they needed was to face the facts and to make up your mind what you want to do about it.

Let me put the facts to you as I see it. In the war on poverty at home, and we can't cover everything here today, if this nation with a gross national product of \$757 billion this year, with unprecedented prosperity, with more people enjoying the good life than any civilization ever dreamed humanly possible at any time in recorded history, if we can't do something about the evils of poverty and slumism, who do you think can? It just boils down to the fact that we are fortunate in this country to have resources in terms of goods and services and manpower and talent and ability,

technology, science, such as no other nation on the face of the earth.

Therefore, to dream big dreams, to have big hopes, does not make you foolish. It makes you a realist. What is more, America ought to stand for something in this world besides its wealth, and its power. It ought to stand for hope, and it ought to stand for promise, and if my religious teachings mean anything to me, precept and example are every bit as important as the word, and precept and example is what this nation needs to set.

Now in trying to improve our social structure, I think we ought to recognize that we are dealing with the hard, tough problem. We are not dealing with what we had during the Depression, when there were 15 million unemployed, most of whom were talented and gifted, most of whom had had jobs, most of whom knew what they--how to work, most of whom had a skill, most of whom had been self-sustaining. We're not talking about that kind of unemployment now or that sort of social problem. We're talking about a group of people today that have never had a job, we're talking about a group of people that have been on welfare for three and four generations in many instances. We're talking about young people if you please, that for the first time have been able to see how the rest of the world lives over the television. I know of no single invention that has so changed the thinking of a nation and a world as the tube, television. It is one thing to hear about it. It is another thing to see it. Rising expectations is not phenomenon merely for Asia and Latin America. It is also one for

the United States of America. So, we're down here, as I used to use an analogy in my home state, of where the high grade iron ore--we were the great iron ore producing state--is gone, and we had to find a way in my state of Minnesota of how to beneficiate, as we say, to upgrade low grade iron ore. This may be a poor analogy, but I think it makes my point. I'm not trying to talk about people as being high grade and low grade. I'm talking in terms of their developed skills, their incentives, their attitude, their perspective, their environment. I can't stand and judge, I'm only mortal, I'm not divine, as to which of the people are better and who is better than the other. I can, however, judge somewhat as to their skills and their aptitude and their talents as we see them now.

Back in my home state of Minnesota, in the 1950's, we had unemployment as high as 35-40% on the iron range--35 and 40%. Many a community, 25%. The high grade ore was gone. The low grade ore was there in abundance. There was little or no investment, and there were no jobs. And the young people were leaving the communities. The stores were closing. Shops were being forsaken and left idle. And then we came along with a process that we discovered that could beneficiate over two billion tons of taconite ore, which is harder than granite and had very little iron in it. But by being able to process it, by being able to beneficiate it, as we say, and by willingness to make a substantial investment in it, we today find that we have one of the most productive economies that America has ever known in an area that only less than a decade ago was prostrate,

desperate and in depression.

Now I think the same thing can be done with people. I believe that this is what we are trying to do. We're not trying to operate a program in America today, federal, state, local and private, that makes poverty just a little less painful. We're not issuing opiates or giving political aspirin. That is what a welfare check is. A welfare check does that. And by the way, that may be necessary. I don't want to be misunderstood. There are times that it is important to alleviate pain. There are times that it is important to try to ease the unbelievable pain and travail that comes through either physical or mental or emotional illness. And the same can be said in terms of people who are the victims of poverty. Therefore, a welfare check is not to be set aside as being undesirable. But it is to be judged as less desirable than trying to find a way to make that recipient of welfare a self-sustaining, self-respecting, productive person. John Stuart Mill once said that if a man has nothing to do for his country, he has no love for it. I think that is about as pertinent and poignant a statement as one could make to a group that is studying our social-economic problems.

The trouble in America today is that there is about one-seventh of our people today who live under what we call the standards of poverty, or below poverty. It was a sixth two years ago. It is now down to a seventh, so we have made some progress. One seventh of our people, who have literally had little or nothing to do for their country, for their country. The country maybe has been doing something to them and some people think something for them, but they've not been able to do anything for their

country, for their neighborhood, for their city, for their family. And how can you have love for it if you have no participation in it.

So we have sought to try to find ways to get at the root causes of poverty. I met this morning with 35 to 40 of the top industrialists of this nation to discuss with them how we could get them to go into areas of the ghetto, the slum, both rural and city, slum areas, where the poor people live, and put in a plant and train the workers, and not just train them, but earn and train at the same time. What did the government have to do? What was the government's responsibility? You see, I don't believe that the government ought to just train all the workers in government institutions and have people who are in those training institutions know that they are on a government payroll, as such. I think it is better for the government to have a partnership with the private economy in which the individual learns and earns at the same time, in the mainstream of the economic life of this country, utilizing, to be sure, the schools, utilizing the technical institutes, but utilizing also the knowhow, the technical knowhow, the management knowhow, of the private enterprise system.

Now we know this will because we have tried it. I just was in the Navajo Indian Reservation country Saturday. I saw the Navajos, what they are doing, a group of wonderful Americans that have been sorely mistreated, unbelievable injustice. You talk about injustice, my dear friends, the injustice to the American Indian is beyond human comprehension. These are the people that were decimated only less than a hundred years ago.

Their ranks were down to 2,000. The victims of the expansion of America to the West. Well, these Navajos today are 100,000 strong. Their young are going to school. Fairchild Aviation Company is out there at Fort Defiance. General Dynamics is at Window Lock. New companies are coming in. Youngsters are getting jobs. Old arts and crafts are being reactivated. The land is being improved. Agriculture is being modernized. Schools are being built. And poverty is being defeated in an area that is as big as the state of West Virginia--the Reservation of the Navajos.

So we are making some progress. But it took a lot of time. And what's more is it takes a great deal of faith, faith and works. Now one of the things that is discouraging to me today is to see how impatient people become when they begin to lose faith that they can accomplish what we need to accomplish.

Now, on this domestic scene--I've talked too long already--I classify the problems we have in our great urban areas today as slumism, not just the slums, but slumism. That term to me means more than obsolete buildings. It means more to me than dirty streets and trash on the streets. It means more to me than just rat-infested tenements, even though all of that, and all that I've said is characteristic of the slums. It also means people who feel inadequate, people filled with bitterness and despair, people filled with frustration and animosity, and that may boil over into hatred and violence. The poverty of the spirit is much worse than the poverty of the purse. The poverty of the purse can be corrected

immediately, by a grant, by a check. But the poverty of the spirit means that a man literally must be reborn, both in a spiritual and a social sense.

The Minister in my church out in Minneapolis made a sermon one Sunday entitled, and some of you, I think Dr. Nye remembers that I mentioned this at the National Council of Churches Meeting, and this is my faith, this is my politics, this is my religion, and it is very simple and I don't have to get confused. The way you treat people is the way you treat God. I have seen people, and I was brought up to believe that there was a little bit of the Divine in each of us, maybe not much, but a spark there that we could fan into a flame. I was brought up to believe that the only reason that man is differentiated from animal is because God created man in his own image, and when I used to teach at McAllister College, I said that is the only reason you ought to have a right to vote, because sometimes you vote wrong.

You know we used to sit around--I didn't mean that in a partisan sense, even though that is entirely probable--we would sit around there in our American Government class, and I would say, "Well what is democracy?" And they'd say, well it is a Constitution, it is free speech, it is free press, and freedom to worship. And I'd say, well now wait a minute. That is not a description of democracy. That is not the philosophical tenet of democracy. Those are the fringe benefits. What democracy is is human dignity. It is based on the concept of human dignity. Now some people don't act very dignified. Then how can you say that there is anything called human dignity? Because you believe in the doctrine of natural rights, if

you're one of those, or you believe that God created man in his own image. And if he did, then no one should have the right to govern him without his consent. And he should have a right to express that which is in his soul and his spirit. That is the only moral, philosophical justification for free speech. Goodness me, when I think of the number of speeches I've made and what I said, I'm sure there isn't reason anybody should justify free speech on the basis of what I've said sometimes. But people are entitled to the right of dissent. It is not just so government officials won't get too big for their britches. The right of dissent is that a man is entitled to be wrong, because he is a human being. He is entitled to be right, too. He may be right, too. So we have to get down to some of the fundamentals before we can talk about programs.

Now our programs are many. And I want to remind you of this, that while there are those today that feel that we should be spending more, we're having a tough time up in Congress getting anybody to spend as much as we have asked for. Every day I hear somebody say--one of my good friends in the Senate on Sunday said we needed \$200 billion urban program. I suppose he is right. And I want to tell you something. The Humphrey family needs a lot of things, too, but they are not going to get it, because I can't afford it. If I get one more mortgage, they're going to have all those lawyers I saw out here in bankruptcy proceedings after me.

It is very interesting to say what you need, very very very good to say what you would like to do, and I think we ought to. And I like to

dream big dreams. And I want to keep planning and looking ahead. And I want to be able to allocate the resources that we have. But in the meantime, it is kind of good to be able to use what you have, and to see if you can get what you're asking for--to get what you are asking for. And in this impatient generation, very few want to start at the bottom. Very few want to start with what would seem to be a beginning salary, or a beginning position. They like to start going full blast. Well, I didn't start that way and most of you didn't, nor did America, by the way. It didn't even start with universal manhood suffrage. As I have told some of my friends who have been highly critical of recent elections in Southeast Asia, at least they had one. We didn't even have one--the first one, and the second election, John Adams only got 31% of the vote and became President. A hundred people were invited to the Constitutional Convention under anything but less than candid circumstances. The credibility gap was very wide. Madison and Hamilton and George Washington invited them there to take another look at the Articles of Confederation and make a few repairs. They got inside the hall, closed the doors, kicked out the newspapermen, locked and bolted the doors, and the windows, put two people on Benjamin Franklin so he wouldn't talk at night after he got a glass of wine in him, and never saw a newspaperman from May until September. They proceeded--their first act--their first act, despite the fact that they had sent letters out saying that they wanted to only take a look at the Articles of Confederation and possibly to make mild revisions, their first

act was to abolish the Articles right off the bat. One hundred were invited. Fifty-five came. The fifty-five that came didn't get there until two weeks late. Thirty-nine stayed and only thirty-eight signed. They barely got a quorum. The Capital of the United States was moved eleven times in 1776 to 1790. We weren't always so nice and tidy.

Thomas Jefferson met the British Ambassador when he came to present his credentials at the White House with Jefferson standing in his nightgown. I remind some students occasionally that come up to my office about these things.

I mention only this because we are a nation that has made steady progress. We did not have the millenium to start with and then start to erode it. We started very simply. We started in a very primitive manner. We've built from it. We even stopped foreign aid. I had a young man jump up in an audience not long ago and challenge me on something about the money we were spending abroad, and the fact that we were always helping the wrong people. I said, "Do you think Louis XVI helped us at the battle of Yorktown because he was a great democrat with a small d and he loved the spirit of the French Revolution which subsequently beheaded?" He helped us because he thought it was in his national interest. He wasn't pro American. He was anti British. But today we have got to have it all figured out in a neat syllogism. We've got to have a full system of logic on everything. And at the battle of Yorktown, there were more Frenchmen than there were Americans, and more Frenchmen died than Americans.

And it was the French fleet that bottled up the British Fleet, not the American fleet. And we got a \$77 million loan from the King of France, the worst autocrat on all of the European continent, in the name of freedom and democracy. So don't let it bother you too much if occasionally something looks a little bit out of joint in present day methods. We have made some progress, not as much as I would like.

Now, my final point to you, and I've been saying that two or three times, I guess, my final point to you is that there are some programs over there at Congress that I'd like to have you take a look at. Now I'm not a professional critic of the Congress. I've served there sixteen years and I know that when people get in the Executive Branch, or when they get into journalism or commentators or when they get into the ministry or in business, they decide Congress is the greatest enemy of the people. It's not. And all the wisdom in this country is not to be found in commentators, ministers, or executives. The Congress of the United States works a little slowly, **somet**imes it doesn't go as fast as you'd like. Sometimes it goes a little faster than you might like. It represents pretty well the broad cross section of the American public, and if every once in awhile you see something that looks a little unsavory in Congress, why just go home and put the mirror up, if not for you, the Congress is like a mighty mirror over the entire American economy. And if there is occasionally somebody in the Congress that acts like a bigot, remember he is representing some. And they've got a lot of them around the country. And if there is somebody in the Congress that is still trying to get his nose under the tent of the

Twentieth Century, remember there are some like that, too. And if there are some in the Congress that seem to be going clear into the year of 2000, remember there are some like that that are to be represented. This is representative government. This isn't a government of angels and of saints. This is not even a government of Presbyterian ministers. This is a government of the people. And it has its limitations. But by and large, that Congressional process works pretty well. It needs occasionally a little touch. And that's what I'd like to mention to you.

For example, we've got a bill up there now in one of our committees, truth in lending. That would be very helpful to the consumer. In the Senate it has passed. If you happen to be up on Capitol Hill, you might say that you'd like to know what interest rates you pay. You'd like to see that truth in lending legislation. It is really just like fair packaging, fair labeling.

There is another one up there on campaign financing. The Senate has passed it, and we'd like to get it out of the other body. There's the Inter-American Development Bank that relates to our Latin American friends, and our great program of Alliance for Progress. It has passed the House and Senate and it is awaiting for a conference report. Oh, there are so many. I brought them all over here. I thought maybe you might want to see them, and I send one of my men over to get that list of the legislative proposals. But let me just point out to you what is waiting on us on your front, on the home front, right here on the urban front. The crime control legislation. Now that is a very modest proposal. That's

what we call our safe streets, and crime control bill, that will strengthen police departments throughout the country, that will not only strengthen them, but will provide training and human relations as well as crime detection and crime prevention. It will upgrade the quality of police personnel and police performance, that will look in to police methods, that permit states and localities to provide crime laboratories and police training institutes.

We've got a big argument going on up in Congress now whether or not this should be something that goes to the Governors or to the Mayors. In the meantime, I might suggest to you that it is residing there in committee, and everybody makes speeches about the crime wave. Well, I was the Mayor of a city, and I was glad to see the way I was introduced, a man from St. Paul that became Mayor of St. Paul's Twin Cities. My, I wish I had thought of that. I would have had all the votes in both cities.

But we definitely need to upgrade our police services. You're not going to be able to get policemen, my dear friends, unless you do. You're going to have to upgrade their pay, their working conditions, their civil service standards, their training, not only in criminal apprehension, but in human relations. And I would think if there wasn't anything that the church people could do that is more important right now, than to try to figure out the role of the police in community relations, because law enforcement is not the problem. The problem is law observance. How do you get people to observe the law without having to use the club or the

tear gas to get observance of law enforcement? Should you have special public administration specialists tell you that all the police should be centralized? Maybe. I didn't believe it, even though I taught the course. I feel I owe most of my students a refund after having been in government for awhile.

When I was Mayor of my city, and some of you may know this here that are from the Twin Cities, we had what we called thirteen community councils, and every one of those community councils had to approve the assignment of a police officer in their jurisdiction. A man was on probation for six months. He didn't get assigned unless he was approved by that community council which represented the business, labor, civic, religious groups, etc., of that community. I felt that a police officer ought to be able to work with the people. I have often felt today that one of our police problems is that it is so mechanized. You never get to meet the policemen. They are running up and down the street trying to catch the fellow that is running up and down the street, all of them in a car. But you can't do the job of law enforcement that needs to be done without money and people. Now I know that money isn't everything, but as that old fellow said, it runs a good second best in some of these things.

What about firearms control? Are we still going to go around thinking that we are the society of Daniel Boone? And Bill Cody? Or are we going to put some limitations upon lethal firearms? Wouldn't you think that we would be able to make that? Maybe you can help.

What about the juvenile delinquency act which fortifies and strengthens local and state departments of correction? It doesn't cost much. We're asking only for \$25 million. The Economic opportunity act is still there. The President sent it--the poor President. He gets blamed for everything. You would think that he was opposed to poverty--the War on Poverty. He sent up a request in March for \$2,600,000. The question was in the early months in the papers here in Washington and all around the country, will it be less or will it be more, and all the wise guys said, uh huh. Since the election of 66 he will have to cut back, because the people were angry, said the columnists and none of them ever run for an election in their life, they said the President will have to cut back. Well, the President didn't cut back. He added \$400 million, because we thought that this program was essential, an investment in this country. But it is up there in Congress yet--\$2,600,000 and it hasn't passed even the authorization, much less the appropriation.

Model Cities. Some of you have read about where I have mentioned that we ought to have a Marshall Plan for American cities. The Model Cities legislation is that plan. It provides the opportunity to mobilize all of the human and tangible resources of a community and a neighborhood for the modernization and the rebuilding of that neighborhood, including the rehabilitation of the people. And it should be on a sustained basis, because there is no use of having this in and out, one year a program and next year not. You lose all momentum. The secret of the Marshall

Plan in Europe was that it was a commitment by this government of five years, and you could depend on it, we said. The other secret to it was that it required planning at the end of the line where the money came as well as planning from the front of the line from whence the money came. So does the Model Cities program, exactly the same way. The President asked for a five year commitment. He only got two, but it can be renewed. The President asked for planning at the local level with every instrumentality public and private in the locality. And it provided a firm commitment of funds. Ladies and gentlemen, it is still up there, and every day somebody tells us that we're not doing enough for the cities. Who is we? You know the President can't order these funds. He doesn't get a nickel more than the Congress gives him. And as a former member of the Congress, we tie on about 25 provisos, limitations to each little paragraph.

Rent supplements. The rent supplements program is not a very radical program, by the way. It was the heart and core of the Chamber of Commerce proposal in 1937 as it sought to resist public housing. When I talked to my friend, Everett Dirksen, about that, Senator Dirksen is supporting rent supplements. I said, "Everett, both of us are now caught up to 1937. We're going strong." And say this because he is a great help. I don't want to be misunderstood. He is a good opposition when he wants to be, and he is a great help when he wants to be, and he generally wants to be. So, let's..... Now you can take that wants to be either way.

We have a program before the Congress called urban renewal. You know what that is, because some of you have had it in your cities -- \$750 million. It is still there. Urban transit. It takes longer to get from Brooklyn to the Queens or to Manhattan, longer to get from a place in Brooklyn over to downtown Manhattan than it does to get from Washington, D. C. to Detroit by plane. We have created the greatest system of transportation that the world has ever known and now we don't know how to untangle it. But urban mass transit is absolutely essential. Have you ever stopped to think of the amount of time and money that is wasted trying to move in this country. Really, it's one of the -- we talked about this this morning. If you really want to know what makes some of the commodities that you buy cost so much, just take a look at the time that it takes for the worker to get back and forth to his job, the cost of transportation. It is built right in, you know. You can't do these things for nothing. The American corporation is not the United Presbyterian Church. A corporation is supposed to make a profit. They've got stockholders. They're not engaged in family service or the United Fund, except as contributors.

Well we have the Neighborhood Facilities Program, Urban Research, Family Relocation assistance, rat extermination. Now that stirred up more fuss down here than anything you can think of. Rat extermination. And I don't hold a grudge against those who thought that the legislation wasn't needed. Really and truly, it is all a matter of your experience. If you live out in the country where you can get a 22 rifle and go out there and, as I used to as a boy, wait around until the rats came

out of the barn and shoot them, it was kind of fun. As a matter of fact, you kind of liked to save the rats for your own hunting, you know. But that's a day gone by for most people. The fact of the matter is that the rat infestation problem in this country is a major public health problem. The fact of the matter is that it is a source of great travail and trouble to the poor. The fact is that this city is infested with them. The fact is, and I'm speaking of the four legged ones, the fact is that many a city is. And we need a rat extermination program if there had never been a War on Poverty. I must say if you want to find out about the necessity of a rat extermination program, go see the hotel and restaurant inspectors of any city. Go see them, and ask them what they find in the places where some of you may eat. So we need a program, but we didn't get it because some body laughed it out of Congress.

Manpower Training and Development. We provided training for a half a million people that never had it. That program is still in the Congress.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act--\$1,600,000 request. Still unacted on. No action. Child Nutrition, and school lunch programs. We have a request before the Congress for \$348 million. We've doubled that program in the last three years, because children need this kind of care. Still unacted upon.

Mental retardation. Mental retardation. Now you folks know of my keen interest in this if only from a personal point of view, of Mrs. Humphrey's interest in it. Every child in this country is entitled to a

fair break, sick or well. Every person in this land of ours, as a citizen of this land, is entitled to an education. And even if it requires specialized education. We didn't build schools just for the healthy, and the rich, and the middle class. And when you ask for \$25 million for mental retardation, let me tell you that is but a small down payment on what you ought to be doing.

And yet there it languishes. Any of you ever had this affliction in your family? There are an awful lot of people in America that have; there are 6 million of them and of all the disgraceful things in America it's the manner in which we take care of our mentally retarded. How can you be a Christian and let that happen. Have you been in these institutions?

My wife is in Europe right now attending a mental retardation conference. Have you ever seen the pain that comes to a family where this affliction hits? In this richest of all countries, don't tell me we can't afford 25 million dollars for mental retardation. They spend that much on a very good safari or some big convention. Well, we've got a request of 6 billion, 8 million dollars up before the Congress. I mention this to you because I want you to know that we have this year's budget, fiscal '68, the total sums for cities amount to 10 billion, 300 million dollars. That's exactly three times what it was 5 years ago. The total amount of money that's allocated for all of the areas of the poor, from medicare benefits to the poor (I'm talking now to the poor) for Social Security payments to the poor, the total amount of money is 26.3 billions of dollars. So when I hear somebody say we ought to spend as much on the poor as we do on Vietnam, we spend 4 billion dollars more.

I wish we didn't have to spend any on war. I had somebody say to me the other day, said the war is unpopular. I said I hope I never see the day that a war is popular in this country. The day that a war is popular, that's the day that America has lost any hope of sustaining its moral fibers. Wars ought to be unpopular and anybody that has anything to him at all ought to pray for, look for and work for the day that

they are stopped and that they are brought to an end. (APPLAUSE)

Well, now I've given you the speech, I'll take the questions. Thank you, very much. (APPLAUSE)

MODERATOR: Mr. Vice President, this has been one of the most stimulating and scintillating talks I think that any of us have heard in a long, long, long time.

MR. HUMPHREY: I didn't intend to make it.

MODERATOR: Well, if you have been feeling not quite up to par, you certainly have been doing very, very well. You will be interested to know that your group formulated many questions yesterday covering a whole multitude of fields and that we wanted to bring many of these questions to you. In the interest of time we tried to merge and consolidate some of these questions and remarkably you have moved in on a vast number of them, covering them in many different ways. Now we we may want to touch on some of these questions again and try to be a bit more specific.

You were speaking of the progress we have been making, of your own impatience which I think many of us share, of your great optimism and of your concern about what you call slumism. Many of us believe that our nation is in serious danger of turning toward anarchy or a police state in response to the fears that have been created by the chaos in our ghettos, and we wonder what you believe about this danger. We wonder in connection with this what prospects you feel there are for Congress to pass some of the bills that you mentioned. In specific, such bills as the rental supplement, the full model cities appropriation, the requested funds for our National Mortgages Association,

even the whole rat control program. Is there any possibility of these being passed. Is there anything the Administration is going to do to try to get them passed?

MR. HUMPHREY: On the latter point, every day of the week we meet on ways and means to get them passed. Yesterday I was with the President on two meetings with our legislative leaders. Last night with House and Senate legislative leaders; earlier in the day with all the Congressional liaison officers to the departments that work with the Government, I mean with the Congress. The President is a man that wants legislation and wants it badly. I don't know of any man that is better at getting the Congress to legislate. His main problem has been that when the legislation why very few people seem to realize the amount of work that's gone into it and the difficulties that are entailed.

On the legislation, I think you will see that the Senate of the United States passes the rat control legislation, the so-called Rat Extermination Bill. We have been working with our friends in the House of Representatives and hopefully if the Senate passes the full appropriation we'll get a good ratio or good proportion of it in the final bill. As you know, when the House passes nothing in an area and the Senate passes the full appropriation, generally when they come together they split the difference or hopefully it's a little better than that. So I would imagine we could look forward to legislation on that front and fronts.

By the way, while we asked for 20 million dollars for the fiscal year, remember that July and August and part of September of the fiscal year have already gone by, so that if you were able to get 15 million

dollars it would be funded at the rate of about 20 million dollars. I predict, Number One, that we will successfully pass rat extermination legislation, but I'd like to have you call on a few friends while you're up here, just to make sure. (LAUGHTER)

Now on the other concerns, about the danger (I believe you put it) of turning towards a state of anarchy or police state because of the fears created by the chaos in our slums or our ghettos, the most reassuring indication I've had that that will not happen is the public opinion polls that have been taken throughout America. Harris, Quail, Gallup and others showing that most of the people feel that there were injustices and that something ought to be done about them. In other words there wasn't a revulsion of anger; to the contrary I've just seen a very extensive poll this morning that showed that there was a healthy attitude about this. There was also the attitude, however, that the police of our nation need to be strengthened, not so much in terms of their weaponry so to speak or their guns or clubs but their training and their qualifications. So I would think that possibly the nation has been able to take in stride these disturbances of violence and disorder and riot without becoming panicky and without trying to reap vengeance on innocent people.

Now you and I know that rioters and people who commit acts of violence, people who commit acts of destruction of life or property, must be brought before the law, they cannot go unpunished. The important thing to keep in mind is that the community does not punish the innocent because remember that the riots took place in the ghetto areas and many innocent people were the victims of the riots right there and we surely wouldn't

want to have a public reaction that was to deny programs that these communities need. There is some danger of this because people say we musn't reward the rioter. Well now there's a lot of difference between the rioter and the environment in the riot area. There's a great deal of difference between the man that rioted and precipitated a riot, instigated or incited a riot, and the people that hit out during the riot that were scared to death and were running up and down the streets many times only to get away from what was going on. We don't want to punish those people. I think it's fair to say that 90 percent of the people that lived in the slum and ghetto areas had nothing to do with the riot at all, except that they were terrified as were others.

Now there some that grabbed off a bottle of whiskey and a television set and I might add that that's not racial. That has happened regardless of race, color or creed. The appetite for certain juices and for certain mechanical equipment knows no race, creed or nationality. This is not to justify it or condone it; to the contrary, it's merely to set the record straight.

Now let me see, I believe you asked one other part there. No I guess we've taken care of most of it. OEO, yes. The OEO Bill is in the authorization stage. I believe I can give you a fairly good outlook on that. This is our work sheet (boy, we've got a lot of work to do) (LAUGHTER) Man. Yes, on the OEO authorization, House, Education, Labor and Senate Labor Committee hearings are concluded. The Senate Committee has ordered the bill recorded. It's on the Senate calendar. It has not as yet received a rule in the House of Representatives. So it's fair to say that this legislation would most likely not be passed until some

time in the latter part of this month. Hopefully we can maintain the amount that we have in this legislative authorization, because mark it down that if you don't get the full authorization you generally get a little less when you go to the appropriations committee, no matter what your authorization is. There are two steps for every piece of legislation. First, you must authorize it, secondly you must come back and go through the process all again to get it appropriated or funded. We haven't as yet authorized the renewal of the OEO. We have to do that now, and then come back and get the funds. So I would imagine that the funds and the legislation ought to be reported out sometime between now and the middle of October. And if you'll go up and go to work we may make it by the first of October.

One other point. I noticed that there was some note here about the urban coalition. Some of you may have been here. That was one of the most helpful and I think constructive developments that's taken place in this country for a long, long time. I hope that that urban coalition will not merely have one meeting and then go home, but I hope it will become a rather significant permanent development to spur on the Government of the United States and the private sector of our economy to take on the burdens that they need to and the responsibilities that they need to. We have had this sort of thing for years, as you know, headed up by Charles Taft and most of the time on our Foreign Aid Bill, what we call our International Cooperation Program, a broad-based civilian and Government citizens committee that promoted the whole concept of foreign aid, foreign trade and responsible international economic policy. It has been the saving grace, may I say, for the legislative process. I think we need the same thing on all the urban, poverty, slum, social areas. I think we need

it and the urban coalition that came as a result of the tragic riots and violence in our cities, that was just what the doctored ordered, as they would say. But I want to suggest that one dose of it is not enough. You need it as a continuing operation and I hope those of you that have participated will convey that message to the leaders.

MODERATOR: We certainly thank you for those replies to some of our real concerns. We want to move now quickly to another area. You spoke of our great gross national product being in the 775 billion category, of the immense things we can do as a country, of the immense things we are doing. You also mentioned the limitations that you have in your own household that we have in our households on what we can do and what we can't do within our budgets. I think this brings up a question that is in the minds of all of us. You referred in part to it in speaking of the President's State of the Union address, how we have to strike a balance. Could you describe the financial relationship between the tax monies for the Administration's program in poverty and the Vietnam war, and for example such proposals as Philip Randolph's Freedom Budget seriously being considered by the Administration.

MR. HUMPHREY: On the latter, Philip Randolph's Freedom Budget I believe was a 100 million dollar program over a 10-year period. We're doing more than that. I wish that somehow we were clever enough or should I say astute or intelligent enough here in Washington to be able to project to you the immensity of the program which is presently underway. As a matter of fact it's so immense that I'm afraid it's going to be cut in Congress. I notice the rising tide of opposition of what we're doing. Now only how we do it, but what we're doing.

To give you an example, we're spending today, this fiscal year budget, on all forms of aid to education, higher education, research grants to universities, the Atomic Energy Commission, NASA, Department of Defense, Public Health Service, HEW, Elementary and Secondary Education, Vocational Education, National Science Foundation, 12 billion 300 million dollars. Twelve billion, 300 million dollars. In 1961 it was 4 billion. Four billion dollars. Now that gives you some indication of what's happened. We're spending this year in all forms of health protection over 12.5 billion dollars in the Federal budget. That's including Social Security Medicare. We have 4 million patients in the Medicare last year that were admitted to hospitals and 25 million hospital bills that were paid under Medicaid. The hospitals received over 2 billion dollars in outright payments for medical services to the elderly.

In 1960-61, fiscal 1961, we spent under 4 billion dollars for all of the medical programs of the Government of the United States, including the military. This 12.5 billion does not include anything that's from Vietnam; none of the war services of the military.

When I say these things I'm always reluctant to do it because right away somebody says that's what I've been telling you. This bunch is going to spend this country into insolvency. On the one hand we get that and the other hand we get the cry that not enough is being done. I think that maybe our problem is that we proliferated the program, as I indicated to you, to a point where you don't get the total picture. This is why I said that I thought it was necessary for us in a sense to regroup these programs, which is what we're doing. Regroup them into a massive plan for a new urban America because the funds are there. The

tools are there. Now we may have to add. I think you can't have just a 40 million rent supplement program and meet all your housing problems. We surely know that one of the great needs in the years ahead is going to be low rent, low income housing, and not necessarily public housing. We have to find ways and means of accomplishing this. We're doing it. Right now in a couple of our cities we're turning over large amounts of Federal property, choice property, the best. There is property in San Francisco and New York that are the finest property in the world. One of the properties in New York they want \$100,000 an acre for it. That kind of property is going to be made available to a municipal authority. I don't say it will necessarily be in that city, but there are Federal properties that will be made available to a municipality, to a public authority so a public authority can issue public bonds. As you know, the interest on those bonds is tax-free. By free land costs and tax-free bonds you should substantially reduce the cost of housing construction and thereby housing rentals. With some rent supplement you ought to be able to have a massive housing program. We've got large amounts of Federal property that the President is now asking to be released, at least on a 99-year lease or such so that they can be utilized for low income housing right here in Washington.

Now your question in reference to this international situation. Let me just first of all say that on foreign aid the President asked for a foreign aid budget of slightly over 3 billion dollars for the Foreign Aid Act. The total amount of foreign aid in Food for Peace and the Foreign Aid Assistance Act was less than .7 of 1 percent of the gross national product. That's what we requested. Sometimes when you hear people talk about it you'd think we were just shoveling it out. Of course some people

feel that we're not getting much results and the reason for it is that the easy projects have already been done. When you start to apply foreign aid in a backward country, in a country that has little or no technical base, with very few skilled workers, very few if any competent managers, little or no case reserves and a primitive agrarian society, you cannot expect immediate response and results. Our foreign aid to Europe went to the most sophisticated people in the world, and of course when you put the dollars in there they had the skills, when we brought the machinery in there they knew how to operate the machines and of course Europe today is a testimonial to the success of a rehabilitation and foreign assistance program.

But when you get into Africa, when you get into the back country of Latin America, when you get back into the villages and hamlets of Asia it's a different thing. Yet, last night I had dinner with Mr. Desigh? the Finance Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister of India, and they are making progress in India, slow progress, and it's vital that they succeed. It's a democracy. Absolutely imperative that India succeed. Regardless of whether we like what India does in all of her public utterances or not we must stand with her because the example of democratic success, freedom's success, in Asia is the only thing I know that can offset what's happening in China. We've simply got to see that thing through.

Insofar as our Vietnam costs are concerned, the costs in money are high, the costs in lives are higher and the cost in sorrow and sadness can't be measured. I only want to say this, contrary to some of the critics we are spending a great deal more on the domestic programs than we are on anything for Vietnam; far more. In fact so much more that our critics

in Congress are suggesting that we sharply cut the domestic programs rather than have a tax bill. That's the way they think we ought to take care of it. They say if you'll cut out all these frills, this model city stuff, this Elementary and Secondary Education Act and this war on poverty stuff, if you'll do all of that, you won't need to have any tax bill, Mr. President.

The President of the United States feels that the struggle here at home is as critical as any struggle abroad and we want to be able to sustain at least a reasonable level of activity on the domestic front, at the same time that we try to sustain a controlled level of activity on the international front. The pressure in South Vietnam today is not to get out. There is about 10 percent at a maximum of the American people in every survey that we've taken that say you ought to get out. The pressure is to win and get out. When they say win and get out some of them mean by using massive power, far beyond what we have used; we've got that power, it's called nuclear power. The task of statesmanship today, my dear friends, and the ultimate task is to avoid a nuclear war, avoid a nuclear war. (APPLAUSE) I don't know if you can avoid some wars, but you've got to avoid a nuclear war. Your Government has spent a lot of time seeing that that was done. It was this Government that authored the proposed draft for a Nonproliferation Nuclear Treaty. We, that's our idea. The nuclear test ban is our idea. It is this Government that believes that you cannot leave aggression go unchecked without it becoming a very dangerous pattern. I could spend a great deal of time here and I know there are differences of point of view about our involvement in Southeast Asia. I only want to leave this thought with you. We are not involved in

Southeast Asia just because of Vietnam. If that were the only reason some people may have a very good case for saying why. We're not involved there just for that, even though we did have some commitments. I can't believe that three Presidents are all bad. I can't believe that Dwight Eisenhower, John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson didn't know what they were doing, all three of them. I cannot believe for a single minute that all three of them just want war as some people would indicate by their utterances. That's not true. There's no man that I know of, so help me, that wants this thing settled any quicker and any sooner and on reasonable terms and very fair terms and to stop the fighting than the man in the White House. It's not easy to be the President of the United States and order somebody into battle. It's a terribly difficult, terribly hard thing. And no President of the United States has ever been a fiend, but if you think this President is taking criticism, you ought to read about ^{what} some other ones took. James Madison, the War of 1812. They called him a murderous jackass. He was written up in every newspaper in America as being nothing but a venal murderer. That was 1812. Prior to that, if you have division in this country in the War of 1812, there was an actual secession movement in the New England States. There was plenty of it.

By the way, I want to say to you most respectfully, and I'm not being critical, that most of this opposition was lead by intellectuals at the academic level and ministers, understandably so. There is a very important historical paper in the Library of Congress on Presidents and Wars. There has never been a popular President in a war. Winston Churchill lead a great struggle to victory in Britain and they fired him the day after the war was over. Franklin Roosevelt had a great victory,

he was the Commander-in-Chief and the Congress went 2:1 to the opposition the day after the war was over. Woodrow Wilson went down in absolute broken heart and broken body at the end of the war. There have never been any popular end of the war Presidents. Abraham Lincoln never even got a majority vote. He didn't even dare run on the Republican ticket for the second time; ran on the Union ticket. Remember that. Eleven of the 36 Presidents of the United States have never had 50 percent of the vote. They've ranged all the way from 31 percent to 49 percent. Wars are not popular. Thank goodness.

But we're in Vietnam not just because of Vietnam. We're in Vietnam because we happen to believe that that entire area of Southeast Asia and indeed the subcontinent was a very likely target for the advance of Communist infiltration and take-over and the evidence is on our side. The evidence is on the side of those who believe this. This very day, as I'm speaking to you, the Indians are in battle with the Chinese Communists on their frontier again. Ladies and gentlemen if any country ever tried to fashion its foreign policy to please the Chinese it was India under Krishma Menon. I knew Krishma Menon better than I know anybody in this audience. I served with him in the United Nations. He was the Defense Minister and the Foreign Minister. He literally went to Peiking and says how do you want us to act and India tried to act that way and in 5 years the Chinese attacked them twice. Open naked aggression.

There are two divisions of North Vietnamese troops in Laos today and they've been there ever since the agreement of 1962, despite the fact that in the agreement of 1962 in which the three segments of Laos, conservative, neutralists and the Pathet Lao agreed they would serve in the Government together and all parties that it be a neutralized area.

The Communists waged war, the Pathet Lao never ever filled the three seats in the cabinet and Souvanna Phouma who, during the 1950's in this country was called a rabid neutralist and a friend of the Communist, Souvanna Phouma today is the Prime Minister today of Laos and he came to my office 1 year ago, October 13, and sat down just as this gentleman is sitting here and said, Mr. Vice President, if your country quits bombing North Vietnam you can write off Laos; we'll be dead, we're through. I beg of you to continue. Don't listen to these people. My country's fate is at stake. I said, Mr. Prime Minister, I thought you were a pacifist and a neutralist. He said I'm fighting for the life of my country. Those are his exact words. I never met him before in my life. He's now asked to come again. He's going to be here. The Prime Minister of Singapore who only 2 years ago after he split off from Malasia, made some rather unkind remarks about the United States. He has asked to come to see your President and he said only 2 months ago that the only hope for a free and independent Asia is American victory and presence in Vietnam.

I've met 14 leaders in Asia on 2 trips. I went there 3 times in 1 year. If you want to really get a sick stomach that is the way to get it. You know, you can pick up the bugs. It's inevitable when you travel. Three times and saw 14 heads of state including the President of India, the famous Radhakrishnan. I never found a single one of them, not one, that advocated that we withdraw. To the contrary, everyone of them said we must stay. Some of them said we shouldn't bomb the North, that's tactical. Bombing or not bombing, that's a question of whether it produces any results. Our people think it produces some. We don't think it produces as much as the advocates of it profess and we think it produces more than

the critics say. We think it's a necessity at this particular time.

I just mention these things to you because stakes are big. Indonesia, 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ years ago, my fellow Americans, was a Communist captive state. Sukarno was in the hands of the Peiking Government, the Communist Party controlled Indonesia lock, stock and barrel. It had withdrawn from the United Nations. It had withdrawn from the World Bank. It had cancelled its relations with this country and with others. They pulled the coup to clean it up once and for all, in ^{other} words to make sure there wasn't a single non-Communist left and they tried to kill 7 of the leading generals; they got 5, 2 remained. Of the 5 they had the most despicable type of brutality was displayed. I want to just share one little intimate bit of information with you. Some of the generals were sliced by the woman's league for peace with razors for 5 days, piece by piece, buried and exhumed 2 weeks later and dragged through the streets to intimidate the populace. The woman's league for peace, in Indonesia. That's a fact. That's a historical fact registered in the United Nations, in your Government, in the press of the world.

Today Indonesia stands free. Adam Malik, the Foreign Minister of Indonesia is a friend of mine of almost 20 years standing. Adam Malik came to see me as the Vice President of the United States on September 23, 1966, Minneapolis, Minnesota, Sheraton Ritz Hotel. He had been to the United Nations. He had to go back to his country. He said I want to share some thoughts with you. We sat down and talked. And he told me how they had fought for their freedom to rid their country of Communist control and 450,000 people died in that effort; 450,000. I asked the distinguished Foreign Minister whether or not he felt that our activities

in Vietnam were right or wrong, injurious or helpful. I think you know what the answer was, as the answer is of General Suharto of his Government. That our presence is essential.

Ladies and gentlemen, how can everybody be so wrong that's there? How can they all be that wrong. We're not just fighting for Vietnam, we're trying to see that that part of the world does not become invested, infected area because those people have the right to live too. I know that you are not as interested in the war between Malasia and Indonesia as you are of our own efforts, our own tragedies and sorrows in the war in Vietnam, but ladies and gentlemen, there had been a war going on for better than 3 years between Indonesia and Malasia and hundreds and thousands of people were casualties. That war has been settled. Peace has been restored. Southeast Asian Association has been established. The Asian and Pacific Conference held its second meeting at Bangkok this year. There is more regional cooperation going on in Asia from Korea and Japan on down to the Philippines, Thailand, to Burma, to Vietnam, to Combodia, than there has ever been before in the history of that part of the world. It's not all bad. The tragedy is there. Korea was a tragedy too, but I doubt there are very many Americans right now that think we didn't do right by going to Korea.

I know how unpopular Mr. Truman was. Mr. Truman's public opinion poll was 26 percent on the day he fired MacArthur in the name of being the civilian Commander-in-Chief, and there weren't very many people in Congress speaking up for Mr. Truman. He was about as unpopular as a polecat at a garden party. But if you go out on this street tonight, this afternoon, and ask the first ten people you meet to name you five prominent Americans

that they have respect for, one of them will be Harry Truman. I'll tell you why. He wasn't popular when he was President, but he did what was right. He made the decisions that were the tough ones. He faced up to the Russians in Berlin. He faced up to them in Turkey. He faced up to them in Iran. He faced up to them in Greece. He faced up to them in Korea. He didn't run and America lost thousands of men, 258,000 casualties in Korea, 55,000 dead.

If I were to have asked you 5 years ago will Korea ever amount to anything there isn't a one of you here that would have dared say anything else but what it's a hopeless mess. And it was so judged a hopeless mess 5 years ago. That's the terminology that was best descriptive. Today Korea represents the greatest economic break-through in Asia outside of Japan and with all of their inaccuracies and inadequacies in their election, they've had two elections for President, both of which have been judged fair, and they had elections for the house assembly and the senate in which they've had some difficulty but relatively free elections. The country is on the move. I've been there 4 times myself. What do you think would have happened if it would have gone. What kind of a Government do you think there would be in Japan today where there is a powerful Communist Party and left wing socialist party as it is. I happen to think you have to make some tough decisions. Political popularity is a cheap currency, ladies and gentlemen, and a man that's in public life that wants to stay popular at the expense of principle is a danger; he's a detriment to the national interest. Political popularity is like money in the bank, credit, a line to be spent, to be used for purposes that the nation needs. I don't need to give you the historical analogy. Washington wasn't popular

when he was fighting the revolution. And by the way if you think the Vietnamese have deserters, you go take a look at your own American history; one-third of the total population were Tories and one-fourth of those that were left were deserters. They used to desert from his army faster than they did from the Arvon. Poor old George Washington. Continental Congress couldn't even get around to sending him some bread. They argued. You talk about the inadequacies and inefficiency of Government, Washington up there at Valley Forge and the Continental Congress in Philadelphia and they couldn't even get around to sending him some food. They argued and argued while his men starved.

There is a lot that we Americans ought to remember and then judge. Now I'm not sure that we're always right. The one thing that bothers me is how right some people feel when they think we're wrong. (LAUGHTER) That's what really bothers me. I say this most respectfully, I'm not at all sure that everything we do is the last word and is going to work or maybe is what should be done, but it is the best that we know how to do. The President of the United States put it as bluntly and I think as succinctly as it can be put. It's not hard for a President to do what's right. What else is there for him to do? He's got the highest office within the land, he surely doesn't need to make money, he's provided for in his retirement. He has the highest honors that this nation can put on anybody. There's never been a President of the United States that didn't try to do well. It isn't doing what's right that's hard; it's finding out what's right that's hard. That's the difficult thing. We just don't always know. But the interesting thing to me is that some of us work day and night reading everything we can read and the most secret

information and most inside information, and we make decisions on that and we're accused of doing it wrong. Then somebody reads an article and says I've got the right answer.

Ambassador Bunker was considered to be a great hero, a fine Christian gentleman. His record at the United Nations and India, Dominican Republic, second to none. One of the finest men in America. At 72 years of age the President of the United States called on him to go to Vietnam in the toughest assignment that he could make. And the Secretary of State was called by the President and he said as follows, as I know, I was there: He said, Mr. Secretary, would you mind asking Ellsworth if he would even give thought and consideration to going to Vietnam. I need the best that this country can provide. I've simply got to have the most experienced man that understands bringing people together because his record had been one of bringing the military and the political forces together in economic rehabilitation. Secretary of State went to Mr. Bunker and said, Ellsworth, would you accept an assignment to Vietnam. The President is worried, he hesitates to ask you; I'm doing it indirectly. He feels that you served your country well and faithfully for years, you're a man of 72 years of age maybe you don't feel up to it. Do you know what Mr. Bunker said? He said call the President back and tell him I feel like an 18-year-old Marine; when do I leave.

And he's out there and I'm here in this audience to tell you that there isn't a finer, God-fearing Christian, wholesome, decent man that ever served the country of the United States of America than that Ambassador. I get a little tired and weary when I hear somebody say that his reports are fraudulent or that they are half-truths, or that they are not factual. Mr. Bunker is doing the best that he can do with the great

talents that the Almighty gave him. It's an interesting thing to me that most anybody that's ever been to Vietnam and spent any time there came back with a better understanding and less critical. Some of them came back no more critical at all. Our sharpest critics are those that never went.

I've told some of my friends I've never been known as a lawyer. I lead boy scout troop 6 here in South Dakota, Methodist Church, (LAUGHTER) and I've spent my life in the Senate advocating universal and general disarmament, establishing the Disarmament Agency, the author of the Food for Peace program, one of the co-sponsors of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. That's my record. I didn't go around voting and asking for larger military budgets and I'm not supporting the President's position in Vietnam since he got to be President. I supported the position in 1963, 1960, 1964, before I ever became Vice President of the United States, just exactly as I supported Mr. Truman in Korea, when very few were doing so. Just exactly as I supported the airlift in Berlin when they had very little support for that.

I was looking through some old editorials the other day and I notice that there were some very prominent Americans in 1940 that said in their writings Hitler has won, we should make peace with him. Really all he's tried to do is build a more secure Europe. The lowlands cannot possibly be redeemed. Why should we involve ourselves.

Ladies and gentlemen, I've taken my stand and I know some of you have too and I do it in good faith. All I ask is that you accredit to this Administration and those of us that are officers of Government the same sincerity of purpose that you'd give to yourself if you have a

different point of view. We may be wrong. We pray to God we're not. If we are we want to be right. That's why I support every possible argument and debate on this question. I've never ever yet said that anybody ought to shut up. (APPLAUSE) Not at any time.

Well, that's my argument. I said I wasn't going to make a speech, but, boy, did I ever. (LAUGHTER) I want you to know that I feel better than when I came in. (APPLAUSE)

MODERATOR: Mr. Vice President, I want you to know that the applause you are getting from this audience out here in front of you is an applause from men and women who are on the firing line in every city and every county across our entire United States, trying to do the same kind of work that we are trying to do in the other areas of humanitarian concern. On their behalf and on behalf of the United Presbyterian Church, I want to thank you for all of your thoughtful, stimulating, provocative discussion this afternoon.

MR. HUMPHREY: Thank you very, very much. I must run. Thank you so much. (APPLAUSE)



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