

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

INTERNATIONAL CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP LUNCHEON

WASHINGTON, D. C.

FEBRUARY I, 1968

Within the last IO months, I have travelled to a great many of the countries represented here today -- 20 all told, in Europe, Asia, and Africa. In just the last three months, I have visited 50 American cities.

And I have returned with one message in my mind and heart; This human family of ours -- whether it dwells in America, in Asia, in Latin America, or in Africa -- seeks but one thing.

Every human being on this earth seeks to determine his own destiny in his own way -- free of coercion and tyranny and want.

The search for that right and that freedom is the great story of this last third of the 20th century.

It is being written in old and new nations. It is being written in the cities and towns of America.

It can be a story of cooperation, of building, of lowering the legal and psychological barriers that separate men.

Or it can be a story of selfishness...of a world hopelessly divided between rich and poor... and seething... threatening and threatened.

Which way shall we turn?

That is the question that faces us today. That is the question that each of us in this room can help answer.

For our part, I can tell you where the vast majority of Americans stand.

Social injustice: We oppose it.

Discrimination: We oppose it.

/ Exploitation: We oppose it.

Full opportunity for every man, woman and child: We support it.

Z Self-determination: We support it.

National development: We support it.

National Security: We support it.

Peace: We seek it.

What, for instance, do we mean by national development, at home and abroad?

- -- We mean economic growth.
- -- Education to free the vital human power in every child.

- -- Training, so that men may support their families in dignity.
 - -- Cities that are clean and safe.
- -- Towns and rural communities where all the advantages and opportunities of modern society are at hand.
- -- Creative use of natural resources... rescuing our rivers, preserving our forests.

-- A War on Poverty -- world wide.

And what about self-determination and those "certain inalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" outlined in the American Declaration of Independence? Again, it means the same at home and abroad.

∠ Governments freely elected -- one man, one vote.-

L The birth pangs and the growing pains of democracy that we in America still know so well.

It means civil rights and civil liberties for all men, regardless of color or creed.

courage to act when all the opinions are in.

-- It means a willingness to stand up for other nations when their freedom is threatened.

In the words of President Johnson:

"The foreign policy of the United States is rooted in its life here at home. We will not permit human rights to be restricted in our own country, and we will not support policies abroad which are based on the rule of minorities or the discredited notion that men are unequal before the law."

There is no longer any room for "we" and "they"	
when it comes to hunger, poverty, illiteracy, the source	
among peoples and nations One can no longer succeed	4
at home and fail abroad, or vice versa.	
each conflicteach bearing frustration in this world	7
Despite those who would claim otherwise, that is	A
what most Americans believe.	
I am sure that is what most men of all nations believe. ther are ideals that none of us can claim to have	•
realized.	
Here in America the unity face of poverty is still too	

Here in America the ugly face of poverty is still too well known.

yet saved children of the few from

It has not produced the best in education for every child.

It has not meant opportunity for every American to achieve his full potential -- to determine his own destiny.

You who know us know that we are engaged in a desperate struggle to save our cities -- a struggle begun ate, but not too late.

You know that our legal progress in civil rights over the past 15 years has uncovered a vast and complex array of sociological, educational and economic problems that still mean inequality of opportunity in America.

You know that we in this country are still struggling truly and fully to communicate with one another...to cope with the growing pains of a rapidly developing society...to adapt our institutions, public and private, to the needs of a new and complex age.

Blundarethe Placemakers 4

And you know that we are soberly, slowly, painfully pursuing a stable, lasting peace in the world -- a peace based not on force but on mutual respect...not on homogeniety but on diversity...not on subjugation but on freedom.

Yes, we are trying. We are trying to help ourselves and to help others. We need and welcome others' help.

We are having some successes and some failures.

But we are trying.

We know only, in the words of Abraham Lincoln, that the "dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so must we think anew. We must disenthrall ourselves."

And we know that the challenge of progress and even of survival is a challenge we all share until that day when men "shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; (when) nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more" and when hopes deferred may become realities achieved for the whole family of man.

The way your Treat God.

International Christian Seaduship Jebruary 1, 1968

Dr. Carlson: We have come to an exceptionally high time in our conference, one that we have all looked forward to with good anticipation. We have struggled, Mr. Vice President, with the various problems connected with the role of the Christian through Church and State and we are extremely fortunate to be able to confer with the Vice President in a field where he is so eminently qualified and has such a wealth of experience and such a depth of concern. We are most happy that he is able to wedge into an extremely busy schedule his coming to meet with us.

It has been my privilege to know him for a good many years.

We were educators in Minnesota together -- the schools being only about a mile apart.

The Vice President began his career, as you will recall, in a professional field, but his humanitarian bent turned him to education and then back in 1945 he was elected mayor of Minneapolis and performed outstanding service for his city in the areas of his special concern for education and related fields.

I don't know what our problem is. We've got music coming here but I'm sure, I'm wondering. All right, I'll just stall a little while they find the control.

It was back in 1948 that he was elected to the United States

Senate, re-elected in 1954 and 1960 and in 1964 he was elected to the

Vice Presidency of our country.

He has followed his interests, his expressions of work with a great deal of appreciation and interest. The President of the United States has requested of him a great many services in this field and as he said a moment ago, deeply involved in most of the activities that concern us as a conference.

Just for your reminder, he does serve as Chairman of the Peace Corps Advisory Council, he is honorary Chairman of the National Advisory Council, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Chairman of the Special Cabinet Tack Force on Travel USA, and he's Chairman of the President's Council on Youth Opportunity. Now you notice I have selected out of the long list of obligations and responsibilities that he carries. I have selected those that relate to our special interest and concern.

It is a privilege indeed for me to present the Vice President of the United States to confer with us. He will make a brief statement and then he will entertain some questions and discussion as he may see fit.

The Vice President: Thank you, Dr. Carlson. Thank you for your introduction and the music both.

When I first received the communication from Mr. Zapp about this conference, about this joint committee on public affairs holding its annual conference on the subject of the Christian's role to Church and State and human welfare and human welfare, I asked myself: "Well, should I really attend this one or not?" I had a very busy day on the times that you gave to me and I was looking through my notes here and my secretary had two or three hours that had apparently been indicated by your office that would be suitable for you and I agreed to the five o'clock hour; of course with never realizing that on this day I would have two extra meetings that would have to be piled in on a very busy day, that I had never planned on. I had a meeting with the members of the House of Representatives on subjects relating to our state policy; a meeting with the members of the Senate on the subjects relating to our tax and trade and tariff policies. And I tell you when you meet with House members and Senate members those meetings do not conclude in four or five minutes. They all have something to say, and I have as much to say as anyone, so it takes a little more time.

So I hope you'll forgive me because you're very kind and considerate to wait for me and let me share a moment with you at this late hour of the afternoon.

Just a word of introduction of what I want to say to you in this opening statement and then, as you know, the questions come right from the floor, as I understand it, and we'll do our best to be responsive.

When I studied at Louisiana State University for my Masters degree, I studied in the area of political philosophy as well as in the field of American government. I've always enjoyed reading philosophy and philosophers and particularly in the political field because that's my bent, my interest. I wrote my thesis on the political philosophy of the New Deal, but I wrote my interim or term paper which was the, we really had to do two papers at that school. We had a tough prof -- he was a Hoosier out of Bloomington, Indiana, Dr. Heinemann, and I wrote my interim or term paper on the subject of the political philosophy of the New Testament.

You see I was always new -- New Testament, New Deal -- what seemed to be forward looking.

I read a great deal about the early Christian leaders and

of the church in the first few centuries, how they interpreted the meaning of the Christian doctrine, the Christian faith, and what its relationship was or could be to the problems of man and his life -- the man's living conditions as well as his dying conditions as one of my preacher friends once put it to me.

I, later on, as a young married man, a parent, taking an active interest in the church in my area was a Sunday School teacher.

By the way, I went out to DePauw University not long ago in Indiana for the service and the, well, it was sort of a testimonial and a good-bye to the Bishop Richard Raine, who is the Methodist Bishop in Indiana. He was the Methodist minister at the Hennepin Avenue Methodist Church in Minneapolis, Minnesota. And his youth minister was Lawrence Nye, and I used to work with Larry Nye a great deal.

I was brought up in the Methodist Church. The Reverend

Julian Hart who is the professor of theology and philosophy at Yale

University was my boyhood chum. We conjured up more pranks in
the name of the Methodism and the most any Baptist could ever

think of in the name of the Baptist faith but a little later on, by the way, when I became the Vice President, I had Julian Hart come down to Washington and join Mrs. Humphrey and myself and others at the luncheon that the Vice President gave on the Inaugural Day and Julian gave the prayer and went on to tell a few stories about me to my sons and daughter, all of which added a little luster to the day.

So when I went on to teaching Sunday School I had two classes -- one at night at the Hennepin Methodist Church and the University of Life and I talked to young people and I was a young man myself about the social implications of the Christian faith. It was a course in social action, and then in the morning I would be over at the First Congregational Church -- if any of you are from around Minneapolis you will know that's over by the University, First Church we call it. And it's to that church that I transferred my church affiliation.

And I taught the Old Testament prophets and I'm just plumb full of Isaiah, and Amos and particularly Amos -- he's my kind of man -- and I just love Hosea, Jeremiah, I just loved them. I just read all about them and I have a whole library full of those books right up in my Vice President's office right now.

So when I have time and I really know that it's going to be a rough evening and the audience is going to be a little tough, I just pick up those books and start to get a little of that Old Testament wisdom.

I didn't have time today so take it easy. I've just been up in Congress.

I was always impressed by, in the prophets of the Old
Testament in particular. The great sense of social consciousness
that was there. And I can only paraphrase some of it, but I remember old Amos speaking about justice flowing light a mighty
stream and he really had the spirit, that man was a, he was a
real social actioner; he would have been a demonstrater in any
man's society and been right out fighting for these great and noble
causes.

So I've come to you today with that kind of a background.

I don't claim any life that is without blemish and I surely don't

claim to be a man of the cloth. I am a political man, and I am

always a little wary of men in politics who try to pretend they're

preachers or sometimes even vice versa, but I just thought I would

share this little experience that I've had with you.

When I became Vice President, Dr. Carlson was telling

you some of my duties and I appreciate the listing of them because I'm the only general practitioner in this government outside of the President and I'm just sort of the intern, you see. You get to the main doctor after you get by me. I'm sort of the house doctor. I don't claim to be an expert in any of these particular disciplines but I have had some 18 years of experience around this man's town now and that, you have to be pretty stupid if you don't learn something in 18 years. And you don't have to be too smart to learn a little.

But I am also the Chairman of two other councils or committees that you would be interested in -- one of those councils, I am Chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council commonly known as the Space Council -- that's by act of Congress. Space, that takes me close to the heavens and that was my stature by Congress, not by Presidential appointment.

And then I am also Chairman of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Council known as the Council on Oceanography. And that deals with the oceans and you'll note that every time the Congress gives the Vice President anything to do they put him either out of this world or at the bottom of the sea.

Now the President is a lot kinder to me. He gives me something more ordinary to do like working with young people, the Chairman of the Advisory Committee Council on the Peace Corps and I'm Chairman of the Advisory Committee on the Office of Economic Opportunity and my public life on all standards and seriousness to you has been dedicated to what I call the injustices, trying to correct what I think are injustices or iniquities.

Or to put it more positively, to make our Declaration of Independence, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness more than a pledge -- a reality. You see, our founding fathers didn't say you were going to have happiness. They said you could pursue it. It's just like truth -- you have to search for it, but it can be found as we know in our faith.

When I used to teach government over in that other college,
Macalester College, I've been at Bethel, too, I want you to know
but they didn't hire me over there. The standards are pretty high
over at Bethel, but when I was professor of political science over
at Macalester College I had a course in American government and

it was a freshman course. I sometimes feel after having been in American government I owe those young people a rund for the tuition that they paid for taking my course because I was a book teacher in a sense. This was before I was mayor of Minneapolis and one of the things, though, that I tried to teach my young friends and my students was what I called the essentials of deomocracy. You know I would ask the question: "What is democracy, what does it mean to you, how do you identify it?" Because they would say, you know, when you asked the question: "Well, what kind of a government do you think we have? " and they would say: "It's a democracy" or "It's a democratic government." And they meant without a capital, a small "D". And I'd say: "All right, now what do you mean by that?" Well they'd say: "You know, the right to vote and the right of free speech, the right to assemble, the freedom of conscience." Well I said: "Those are identifying factors or symbols of democracy, but why should a man have the right to vote?"

As a matter of fact, I've seen them vote very wrong according to my point of view -- on two or three elections that I can remember rather vividly and they may do it again which

worries me some.

"Why should they have the right to free speech?" Listen to what some people say. You know it upsets you, doesn't it, sometimes. It upsets me sometimes what I say, so when you really look at it from a very subjective point of view, you say:

Free speech, free press -- look at what's printed, look at what's said, freedom to assemble -- of course those are risks that you take in a free society.

But what is it that's at the very center of freedom, at the very heart of democracy, why democracy, why representative government, why the right to vote, why free speech, why the right to work, why these things? And I think the answer is spiritual not political at all. That's exactly what I've believed all of my life and this is why when I have written as I have an article in a little book on American liberalism, I have said: "Liberalims is not political, democracy is not political, it is essentially spiritual."

And it goes right back to the first words: "God created man in His own image." And it is my view that that which God created in His own image is something more than just flesh and

blood and bones. If there is a quality of the spirt of the soul, there is this priceless, precious quality which makes the identity between God and man, and I think, of course, as a Christian that the life, the birth and the life of Jesus Christ on this earth was to reveal to us that relationship, that identity between God and man and, therefore, if man is in a sense from God then how can anyone govern him without His consent?

This is why the founding fathers said that there are certain inalienable rights. There were interpreted by a great churchman of the Middle Ages or the Renaissance, Thomas Aquinas, as divine rights and the leg rights and so forth. It was called the -- he was the father of the Renaissance -- rebirth of rationality, and natural rights or inalienable rights are rights that come by the fact that man was born of God, created in His image, and that's the full basis, that's the basis of democratic faith and democratic philosophy.

That's the difference between the totalitarian state and the democratic state. Because the totalitarian does not recognize divine power or providence or even nature. It says the State is

the creature of man and man is made to serve the State. The State is highest expression of man's capability or his creativity, of his spirit.

The State, that's what the Communists doctrine says. I studied these doctrines. That's their religion. The State is the supreme. All powerful. The omnipotent.

We, in our philosophy, and the philosophy of freedom, the philosophy of a Thomas Jefferson to make it more parochial and more in terms of our own national experience in history. We say that the State is the servant of man because man is what is important, the individual. And then we say the individual is the all important one because that individual was endowed not by the government, not by the founding fathers, not by the AF of L, not even by the Baptists, and not by the Methodists, and not by the Catholics, and not by President Johnson or former President Eisenhower, but he was endowed by God, by nature with certain inalienable rights that no one can take away on this earth because no one gave them to him on this earth. They're his first possession at birth. The fact that he's called human and not animal and those rights are life.

The right to live and not just to survice. There's a difference.

The right to live and to live with liberty because living without liberty is not very much living. And the purpose of life and liberty is the pursuit of happiness. In fact, life and liberty make possible the pursuit of happiness and the pursuit of happiness lends meaning to life. A beautiful trilogy that those founding fathers thought of and I think one of the reasons for the strength of this nation is that our birth is essentially spiritual.

Who was it that came to found this nation? Ladies and gentlemen? Were they people who were just fleeing the tax collectors? No. Where they people who were just fleeing the oppressors in Europe, that is, the political oppressors? No. The first people who came here were people seeking religious liberty. I think many people forget that. That the men and women who really were the first pioneers of this land, that really made the basic settlement in America, that latched it, the Puritan fathers, not the exploiters, not those that came on over, the men of the old Spanish Main, that came over to get the silver and the gold, but the civiliation that really lasted, the Puritan fathers, the French Huguenots, the Catholic who was driven out of his land

or some other land. They came for religious freedom. The Roger Williams', for example, there were the men. The William Penns and others.

And now if you will just take a look at our heritage which most people forget to do these days, we're so busy with current events, we can't keep up with the flow of news every 15 minutes on the transistor box.

But if you will take a look at our heritage, you will see that it is a great spiritual, theological religious heritage which has been blended into a political life and into an economic and social life. The Protestant ethics and the spirit of capitalism by Max Faber -- a famous book on the motivating force behind free enterprise in America that many a student of government ought to read.

So I get right down to it. And I happen to believe, and this is why I act the way I do, some of you may not like it. I guess there are quite a few who don't, but here's my political, my religious philosophy is simply this: the way you treat people is the way you treat God. I'm unashamed in saying it and proud to say it. I didn't think that up. One of my spiritual counselors

made that statement at a Sunday morning service and when I really needed it. It's a funny thing. Every once in a while you just plain need to have someone talk to you. And it was one of those days when I was feeling pretty depressed, when things had gone pretty badly, rather badly and when you get, well, almost cynical you become distraught, unhappy, depressed. And I'll never forget this minister standing there in the pulpit in the First Church and his sermon was: "The way you treat people is the way you treat God."

Well, if that's the case, then government has some relationship to human welfare. Because thos eof us who are in this government of the people, by the people, and for the people and that's how Lincoln described it and that's the best definition of the purpose of this government that anybody has ever made. A government of the people, by the people and for the people. It's the way you treat people, it's the way you treat God, there is a moral, ethical relationship. A spiritual relationship between the government and the people, and I think the whole justification that one ought to have today, if money is the policy that we try to pursue, and

we pursue them foolishly at times. We pursue them without the efficiency that you want and may be without even the zeal and the integrity that you may feel is necessary. But at least the purpose behind many of these policies is the improvement of man's life.

Now if I were to be asked by you: "What is it, Mr. Vice President, that you and the President of the United States are trying to do? What is it that the President and his Administration are trying to do? What is it that President Johnson has in mind?" With all of the criticism and everybody knowing how to be a better President than he is, according to what I read.

We've a whole city full of new Secretaries of State, this is an amazing city. There is all kinds of talent here untapped, unused.

"What would you do, Mr. Vice President, if two years from now you find yourself teaching in a college" -- which is not beyond the possibilities. I hope you remember what I said here, I may need that job. "What would you say is the hallmark of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration? What would you like to be known for?" And I would say that what we have tried to do is to open the gate of opportunity for as many people as we can possibly

open the gates for. To maximize human opportunity. To do
what that poet and author of the Thirties, Thomas Wolfe, said:
"Every man his chance." Every man the right to life and to work
and to make something out of himself. Whatever his vision and
his manhood can comine to make him. Every man his chance.
That is the promise of America. That's what we're trying to do.

Now we may be fooling. We may not be doing as well.

And I gather from reading the polls that some people don't think
we're doing it at all well.

But what our objective is, and we may falter in its fulfillment and we may stumble along the way but our objective is
opportunity. Opportunity -- that's the best kind of compassion
and the best kind of welfare. Now I've said from many a platform
that I wasn't one to try to make America into a welfare state.

I want to define what I mean. A welfare state is where I'm going
to make sure every day of your life that you have a check out of
the government.

I'm one who believes that America ought to have as its objective a state of opportunity for everybody in this country so you can earn your own check. And make your own life to the best of your ability.

If, however, you're someone that is crippled, incapacitated, either by birth or by accident or by circumstances, then I think a rich and prosperous society ought to be humane enough and generous enough and considerate enough in the spirit of humanity and the spirit of Christian compassion to be a good samaritan, to help. I do not think that compassion reveals weakness. I do not think that charity reveals weakness. I think both compassion and charity reveal strength, moral strength, financial strength, intellectual strength. They indicate character, but I believe that it is not enough to settle just for compassion and charity.

My philosophy is that what the institutions of man, including church, should be directing their attention towards in part at least is to removing the obstacles from man's development, to remove the obstacles from the path of man so that he can walk to his own objectives. Not to carry him, but to clear the road, to equip him to make the march.

Now this is why I've said and I was talking to my wife about it the other day. She's going to make a speech up there in Atlantic City and she said: "You know, Daddy, what I want to talk about it education. You know I mean not just education but education for the

handicapped, the mentally retarded."

You know of our interest in this area, for example, and I think it's nothing short of capital crime that some of God's children who are mentally retarded are so totally ignored by the richest society on the face of this earth. How we can do this to the least of these and say yet that we're Christians. How we can forget them and institutionalize them and put them out of our way, in bad institutions all too often.

But anyway, I didn't want to get off on that. It was just a little diversion.

I happen to think the people, what we're trying to do here and I'm speaking of education where education is the key to unlock that door of opportunity and that door of opportunity has been padlocked for a lot of people in this country, not viciously. Most people don't do things out of meanness. The just do things sometimes thoughtlessly. They do it out of habit. They just haven't stopped to think about it. Really and truly, I've been in public life a long time. Most people are not mean. They don't want to do the bad things. Sometimes they don't even know and most of the time they don't even know they are doing what is wrong or what proves to be wrong or unjust. I

think most people tend to be appealed to, if I didn't think so I wouldn't be in public life. I think they want to do what's right. I don't think there's ever been a president that wanted to so something wrong. As I've heard President Johnson say: "It's no problem for the President to do what's right, his problem is to find out what's right, and then to do it." Of course, there are a lot of points of view as to what's right, particularly in this political field, this international world, this domestic scene of ours. We don't know. I wish sometimes that I was as sure what we're doing is right as I am, as the critics are sure what we're doing is wrong. Oh, I just pray to God that we could be so sure that we're doing what right, but some people know that we're very wrong. They're sure of that. They've got a pipeline and I haven't been able to get through.

So we've tried to do here, friends, is to use the instruments and resources of government not to control men's lives but to liberate them. I happen to think that the process of emancipation is a continuing process. Abraham Lincoln is known for his Proclamation Emancipation. He declared the Negro free. But a man

that is ignorant, illiterate, discriminated against, sick, totally unadjusted to his environment is not a free man. He's as much a slave as if he were in chains. One can be enslaved by his peers as well as he can by a dictator. You can be enslaved by ignorance and prejudice. You can be enslaved by disease. A man who is crippled is enslaved in many ways.

So we are engaged in a constant process in this country not just as a government but all of us, I think, in emancipation, opening our minds to new ideas, testing those new ideas, training our young people for new pursuits and new vocations, trying to improve our qualities of judgment and not just our quantity of information.

This is why the programs that we've tried to pursue here and maybe, I want to repeat again, I don't know how well we're doing. You know a man is a very poor judge of his own actions but in the War on Poverty in federal aid to education, in our great efforts we're making, for example, in child nutrition, in the school lunch programs, in the food stamp program, but primarily in these programs of work-study, Job Corps, adult education, higher education, National Defense Education Act, elementary and secondary education, the VISTA program. What are these programs for? Just to hand out

the goodies? If that's the case, they're not worth it. They're really designed to try to sharpen the sensitivities of people, to improve their capacities to take care of themselves, to give them the key to the door that's been locked in so far as their lives are concerned. It does not good to have a law on the statute books that says there will be no discrimination in employment because of race, color and creed and stop there. If a man that is of a black color has never been trained for a job, has never had an education and the only jobs that are open require training and education. You have to have equal employment opportunity, you will have to have training. Let's put it this way. The skills and tools that equip you for that job and then to remove any artificial barriers because of race or creed or national origin. I think we've made some progress.

Of course I'm one of the few optimists in Washington, you'll find that. I'm going to tell you why. I'm accused every week or so by my friends over here. They're nice friends. I don't mean to be unkind, but some columnist will write and say about the Vice President: ''Well you have to take this statement of the Vice President with

a grain of salt because he is a perennial, congential optimist." I didn't know that was a sin until I got to Washington and I really didn't. My mother and father said: "How wonderful it is to have a boy who has a smile on his face." And I've always been known as a sort of a happy fellow. And I didn't know that in order to be really intelligent, you had to look miserable until I got down here. That's a fact. Then I found out that one of the symptoms of being an intellectual or being intelligent is that you look very unhappy much of the time, disturbed and concerned. Well, I'm not that way.

I must say that some of the happiest people -- Ben Franklin was always known as a very happy man. And I want to tell you he could teach the blind, the deaf and dumb, most of the people today that consider themselves to be highly intelligent because he was a positive man, he was a thoughtful man, he had a great deal of wisdom and he was a happy man.

They used to accuse Abraham Lincoln, you know, of being sort of silly because he always was telling jobs.

I remember the first time when I ran for the Senate in 1948, one of the newspapers out home went after me and said: "This is

not the man to have in Congress. Every time he makes a speech he seems to laugh and tell jokes. What kind of a man is this?"

Then I found out that we had several people like that in government. There was James Madison who used to tell a lot of jokes. He was the father of the Constitution. Benjamin Franklin told them, too, and they were pretty raucous, some of his. And even Woodrow Wilson who had a very keen intellect and a fine intellectual used to be a jokester so I didn't consider it necessarily a blemish on my record, but to get back to why I'm an optimist. I'll tell you why. I'm going to let you in on a great Washington secret. There are so many people over here in this area of pessimism that it's crowded. In order to make a name as a pessimist in this town, you have to be really pessimistic, but you can get over here in the optimists' area and there's hardly anybody over here, just Dr. Carlson and myself -- we're the only ones that are around. So I staked out the optimism area, but I'll tell you what. I think history is on my side.

I think history is on this side of the optimists in this country because with all of our limitations, my dear friends, and we recognize them which is a sign of our strength -- it's only the weak that

will never admit weaness, you know. The strong admit it and do something about it.

But with all of our limitations and all of the mistakes that we've made, there's never been a society that has so extended so many social benefits to humanity as this society of ours, and it's been done under a capitalistic, free enterprise system and an elective representative government system. It didn't take a doctrine of Lenin or Marx, it took a pragmatic approach within a basic philosophy of the preciousness and the dignity of the individual.

And we have, of course, had many blemishes on our national record but I submit that a nation that has as high standard of living as we have, that has as many voluntary agencies as we have, is trying to do good and they do good and it doesn't make it. I don't think it does a lot of good to be cynical about it. They do a tremendous amount of good. I know that many people say that churches fail because look at all sinners. I say that those are just new customers. All I can say is that I've watched the church at work, I've watched the religious people at work and I've watched our other people at work in America and I have seen what

is going on in this country. And I think that much of the reason that our voluntary organizations are effective as they are, your United Funds, many of the reasons that your corporate directors of big business are willing to contribute as much as they do is because they've had basic religious training, most of them. And what is more because the religious ethic of social action and social justice permeates the American environment. You just don't get by in this country by being a scoundrel over a long period of time, anyway. At least that they discover and I want to say to you right now that I believe the church has had a tremendous impact.

Let me give you an example -- civil rights. Now I managed the Civil Rights Bill in 1964 in the United States Senate. I was the majority whip. I think some of you here have had some disagreement with my points of view on this at times -- I mean the methods -- you didn't agree or disagree with the objectives. I found that most people do not agree or disagree on objectives; we disagree on means and that means that the other fellow is not a bad fellow at all. He just has a different point of view as to how to get to that goal than I had and I learned a long time ago that you don't get very far by condemning the other fellow and being mean and nasty and evil because he may find out that you're kind of that way, too, if you keep that up.

And anyway you don't get any converts that way.

When I became the Floor leader for the Civil Rights Bill, now every Civil Rights Bill, I've been introducing those bills since 1948, and some of you know that I was just about as popular as a polecat at a garden party around here. We didn't get many votes when I first came down here, but finally in 1964 we had a massive program, a comprehensive civil rights program -- very controversial, breaking up established patterns -- and it wasn't easy and it wasn't easy for people to accept it, either. And it wasn't easy for people to pass it. How did it really get through Congress? Because of what we did? I happened to be the manager of the Bill, the Floor leader. We have 250 and some amendments and the debate started in February and eneded in June. In June.

I'll tell you how we got and I said in the beginning that the deciding force and factor in this debate will not be the Senate or the House. It will be the churches. And I was right. The churches, the church layment who systematically put themselves to the task of convincing and persuading members of Congress, but more importantly the people in their own communities, their own churches, and I believe

on Poverty in the efforts to help people help themselves in the efforts to help people to really gain a life. You know really that's what we're talking about. It's really coming out at people who are not active as church leaders and have been the recipients of the social philosophy or the spiritual philosophy of the Christian philosophy or the Judea-Christian philosophy that has made them activists who are trying to eliminate social injustice. Now I've talked fire to you too long, but I thought you would like to know my philosophy. I don't think you know much about a man just by coming up here and reeling off a lot of figures and facts. Frankly, you can get that for a dollar in the World Almanac. They've got it right out here and I think that sometimes we confuse philosophy with information.

But what we want to talk about is what makes you tick? Why are you acting the way you're acting? Why are we doing what we're doing? Now that we're always doing it well, but what is our motivation, what are we trying to do? Well, ladies and gentlemen, I've said that one of the curses of America today is slumism, and I don't

mean just brocken-down buildings, and I don't mean just ugly tenements, and I don't mean just dirty streets. I mean broken people. I mean an attitude of mind which is unkind, unChristian, I mean bitterness, hatred, and frustration and indifference that is the real poverty of a man. That's the poverty of the spririt.

The poverty of the purse is the easiest thing in the world to correct in the rich society. A society that's going to produce 800 billion dollars in gross national products this year, almost.

Let's put it in round numbers. It will be about 790 or 795, 800 billion dollars in gross national products and in that society there's one-seventh of our people that live in what we call levels below \$3,000 or the poverty level. The easiest thing for this rich society to do is to just write out a check and give it to everybody that's poor. That will cure it. That will cure this poverty. The poverty of the purse.

Gee, I didn't know I have \$5.00.

The poverty of the purse. There are a lot of people who take care of their family that way. When they get very successful, very busy, when the boy or the girl gets in trouble, write them out a check. When they are crying because they're lonesome, get them a car. When you don't know what's wrong with them, you call them in because you're busy, you have to go somewhere: "What's wrong, dear?" "Well, I don't know. "Maybe you need a new dress."

I happen to think that we've had a little bit too much of what I call checkbook diplomacy, checkbook family life, and checkbook compassion. You need something better than that. You need that, too, don't misunderstand me. The old fellow said: 'Money isn't the best thing in the world.!' He said: ''No, but it runs a good second best.'' It's helpful.

I know that money is important and I don't want to act foolishly but I want to tell you that the real poverty that afflicts America today is not just the poverty of income, but it is the poverty of frustration and not being needed or feeling that you're not needed, not being wanted, being shunted aside, not being included. The poverty of bitterness, the poverty of hatred that breaks out into violence. That's the poverty. That's the one that's going to take some time to cure. That's where the churchmen come in. That's what the religious faith that we have is all about. Man shall be born again. How? What do you mean? The new life. The poverty of Paul who became the great Apotle. He was a poor man until he received the message of Jesus Christ. Then he became a rich man, in spirit, fearless, strong.

My goodness, what a wonderful story that is for anybody to know, whether you're Christian or not. That's an amazing story of rebirth.

A whole new life and that's really what we're talking about today. We're talking about people today that have been living in ignorance and illiteracy, and hopelessness and despair and whose eyes are blank. I have seen them by the hundreds. How do you put that spark back in their eyes? How do you get motivation? How do you get them to want to do something? To lift themselves? To reach out? To want to make the most out of their lives? Every man his chance. How do you get that for him? By handing out money, that's not enough. We've got to see that they have food and clothes and help, but that's not enough. You can survive but you don't live. That's not the pursuit of happiness. That's just hanging on to the thin thread of existence. Happiness comes in fulfillment. Happiness comes in being a part of things. John Stewart Mills said: "A man that who has nothing to do for his country cannot and will not love it." Remember that. Idleness is not just an economic curse but when you have nothing to do for your country which means for your family, your home, your state and your country, you will not love it. Those are real truths.

So what we're trying to do is get people involved in America, getting the poor involved in their own salvation. so to speak, getting the poor involved in the program of education. Doing something for themselves and they're going to stumble and they're going to make mistakes, they're going to waste money. And all the double entry bookkeepers are going to say: "Look at that. Boondoggling." They're wasting a life now, losing their lives, and a drag on themselves and their neighborhood and their community and their nation. And when we experiment to try to find a way for that life to be reborn, for the life to take on meaning, and the little group, the community action group, that doesn't do a good job of keeping its books. Don't call that the great sin. It isn't the money that man wastes that is the great sin, it's the lives that he wastes that's a sin. And we better remember that.

And what we're trying to do in government, believe it or not, with your help, is a partnership, not by government but a partnership with private industry, with local government, with state government, with churches, with fraternal groups, a partnership. We're saying get in the action. Get there. As the kids say: "Get a piece

of the action, "You know, we're saying," Join me. Let's see what we can do to lift people out of this quicksand of their own defeat," And you know it's working. It's working. There are more young people today on jobs than ever before. Thousands of them have been trained. A million of them. 4, 400,000 needy youngsters last summer got work because we tried in America. Camps opened. We found that 20 percent of all camping facilities in America a year ago went on use. 20 percent of them that you had already paid for. You had blankets for them. 20 percent.

We filled them this summer with kids that have never been to camp' in their lives. For the first time they saw a tree, for the first time they had good food, for the first time they had a physical examination, and for the first time they heard about Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts or whatever else it was.

Right here in Washington, D.C. we had 1700 boys at Camp
Roosevelt from the agestof 10 to 16 from the slums that went on out
and had their first camping experience. Not a single incident. Kids
from broken homes, kids that never even knew who their father was,
many of them. But they got their first good taste of good life and so
forth.

Community action. Now I think that's a pretty good program. Now that doesn't always make the headlines. I'll tell you what makes the headlines. The first time that one of those kids gets in trouble -- you know I'm telling you the truth -- but I venture to say and I'm happy to say for our local press here in Washington they did write up the camp and they did give it a good story. Not me, they gave the camp the good story and the youngsters a good story. They need that pat on the back.

Last Sunday in Minneapolis, Minnesota, I can tell you the fraternity boys of the fraternities went out and all of them volunteered to go to community houses, settlement houses, elderly homes, homes for the elderly, hospitals, and they did work. Free -- they had one day a week of community work. I asked them to do that a year ago. I said: "Listen, you kids, I've got some boys, you know, I know what they're up to." I said: "You have all these nice parties over here at the fraternity house. Why don't you fellows do something for somebody that doesn't have this kind of a life. Why don't you go out and volunteer? Help somebody that needs some help." And they took it up just like that. Somebody asked them. They went on

out and last Sunday my boy, nineteen years old, spent all day washing windows. I said: "How many did you wash, Doug?"

And he said: "Sixty." All Sunday.

Now what I saw, however, on th TV and the press last

Sunday was a story about some hippies. Now I'm here to tell

you, my friends, that for every hippie there's a thousand good

kids. And I don't even want to stand in judgment of the hippies.

I just simply say that there's so much going on that's good that we ought not to downgrade or badmouth ourselves. This is a pretty good country. It's a pretty moral country, too. And you've helped make it that way.

Well, those are the five or ten minutes of remarks.

Well, I've got a little bad cold here, so you'll have to bear with me but we'll take some questions here for you.

First question: Mr. Vice President, I am in my community the Chairman of the Community Action Committee, and I have heard there and I've made it a point to listen here during my stay something I've never heard before. I've heard a government agency refer so frequently to the need of the church. I've heard actually some of my

fellow ministers flogging and condemning the church. I've heard government agencies talking about the need for the church. My simple and varied question to you is: Is it just really a matter of policy in the OEO to organize in such a way as to utilize and involve churches in this redemptive and reclamation of ministries out there in the rural sections, in the little towns, and in the cities?

The Vice President: It, sir, is the policy of your government and, in this instance, the OEO being a part of this government, to involve people at the local level in the broadest possible basis, not just the local government people which should be involved, that is your mayor, your city council, your welfare board or whatever group it may be, but to look to the other motivating, energizing, stabilizing constructive forces in that community and ask them to join. Now in your community it may very well be that it's the church or some church here or one or more churchmen that are so desperately needed. Also it may very well be a trade union, it may very well be somebody in a fraternal order.

What we're saying is that it isn't enough just to try to direct these programs through the old, established channels. We must broaden the base and we've included in the law that there should be maximum participation of the poor themselves. Now this causes a lot of people trouble because they say: "What do you mean bringing those poor people in?" One of the reasons they're poor is that they don't own anything and because they're incompetent." You know that's what people say and because they have no capacity, no ability, and here you want to put them on committees.

Well, you know what we've found out? That when they have been brought in and given some time and some patience, remembering that they come at first with little or no experience and with lots of inhibitions, frequently with pent-up -- well, I'm going to say some hatred -- but pent-up, at least, bitterness. It takes a little while for them to ease off and then we find out that some of them are terrific.

I was out here in Denver not long ago at one of the great social action centers. That's where they coordinate a whole series of programs, health, jobs and everything. The director of that center was one year ago one of the people who was being a recipient of training in the poverty program. And just to show you how foolish the government was, his salary is now \$5,000 a year and his secretary's

is \$6,000. And he's running the whole thing. One of the people came to me and said: "Mr. Vice President, do you think you ought to be able to do something about that?" And I said: "Why it's absolutely ludicrous. It's ridiculous." I said: "This man is a genius. He's really marvelous. He's doing a great job here." And I got a hold of him and said: "Ben, why is it that you're, what's this all about?" And he said: "There seems to be some rule or regulation that says that you can't have better than a 20 percent salary increase in any one year. " He said: "You know I came off two years ago (He's been two years in this program, one year he was a trainee and the next year when he moved up to a supervisor's position). He said: "I'm still classified as one of those poverty clients and I'm under the rules." I said: "Well, we'll have to take a look at that." And I found that these rules weren't handed down and fully written, they're generally written by some lawyer fresh out of college. And I thought maybe we ought to change that.

Well to get back to your question, we are changing, by the way.

Getting back to your question. We need the church in these

activities, simply because the church fequently has an entree to the people plus the fact that we think that you can add a dimension of voluntarism, of people to people, of personality, of individual attention that an impersonalized personal public agency like government can't do. This is what the whole voluntary effort is all about.

I've said about our foreign aid program overseas that I think one of the best things about it is not the government people we send over but the things that we can do to the voluntary agencies. What we've been able to do through CARE, for example, through the different church organizations overseas. Fantastic. And why? Because it's individualized. It isn't Uncle Sam. It's Joe Smith. It's somebody that's personal. And that's why we need the church. Plus may I say I just happen to think it's good for churches, too. And good for church people. You get a little closer to people. You know -- gee, we've all failed a lot. Everyone of us when we get right down to it. You know, if all of our welfare programs had worked as good as they should have over the years we wouldn't be in quite as much trouble.

One that I'm interested in is scouting. I was a Scout and a Scoutmaster and I'm very active in the whole effort and right now. And I've said many times about our Scout program, first of all, we can't get enough adult leaders. You know that's one of our problems. But we've never reached down, way down to those kids who really need that Scouting. Most of our little Boy Scouts we get come from pretty good families in the first place. But what we need to do is get right down there and catch these kids who are the dropouts, the kids are really a lot of trouble. I had six of those kids like that when I was Scoutmaster. You know what? They were the best six boys I had.

One thing I found out about kids that get in trouble. They're so clever they can get in a lot of trouble and if you can get them on the right path, they can do an awful lot, too. We've taken into the poverty program, much to the chagrin of Congress and others, kids that are gang leaders. And they say: "Look at that crazy outfit up there in Washington. Here they're dealing with those gang leaders." Well, let me tell you something, anybody that can lead a gang in Chicago, if you can get that guy on the right track, he can lead them

the other way, too, and we found out how to do it. Not enough, but we've found a lot of them. And I've sat down with some of the toughest looking characters I've ever seen in my life. I wanted to get out of that room and I said to _______'Who have you got here? '' I thought I was in the wrong place. He said: ''Well, these are the.'' I forget what he called them now, he had a name for them. But he said: ''These are fellows that have been recruited, that have been with the gangs and these are some toughies, but, frankly, they are the ones that we're bleeding off, bringing around, and they're now leading kids out of the gangs into the education programs, the training programs.''

You know what I found out? There isn't one of you in this audience, with few exceptions, maybe one, maybe two or three, I couldn't. I know that; I was told point blank that I couldn't. Do what? Go into the urban ghettos and get down on the street corner and the pool hall and back alley where the unemployables are and where the kids are that are standing on the corner that have got that sarcastic, cynical, blank look. I couldn't recruit them, as the director of that urban center in Chicago told me, and they have seven of these urban progress centers.

I've been right out in the bowels of our cities, my friends.

I haven't seen much in the papers about it, but I've been there.

I've traveled this country more than any public official of the

United States and that's not just a brag -- that's a fact, I've been
in 49 states and I have traveled by air in three years 500,000 miles
and much of it has been on weekends. There are very few Sundays
that we haven't or Saturdays that we've had off.

Well, I went into this urban progress center and I saw these people and I said: "What are you doing?" They said: "Look, Mr. Vice President, we can't use a highly trained Harvard-University of Minnesota social worker here. They can't recruit these people. We've got to find somebody from them. We get a community agent out of the community and it's a long process and after we get a half a dozen of them, they find the others and they bring in the ones that we need to bring in. And then we put them through an orientation course."

They teach them first how to clean their face and hands, my dear friends. Grooming, and I've heard up here in Congress that they get up and they laugh about what kind of business is this

that teaches people how to groom themselves. Well, we teach them how to, first of all we try to tell them that, "Look, if you're going to get a job and going to have an interview, you ought to know how to look. Don't scare off the prospective employer." And it takes a little time to teach them how to clean themselves. Then we teach them how to use a map, how to get on a bus.

Let me tell you what our experience was with some of these young people. I'm speaking of practical experience. We had a hundred people recruited in one city. It was a test program with an industry that was willing to take them. We got one hundred that had no training at all. We finally got them just like we swept them up and sent them off to this plant. All of them are going to get \$2.00 an hour or more. That's quite a little money to start. Not one of them ever had a job before in their lives. They are going to start out at \$2.00 an hour and time and a half overtime. 95 percent of the hundred were gone after the first two weeks. Never came back, never even came back for their checks. They thought they were in a prison. They had never been inside a factory. They had never known what it was. We bussed them there, took them there and they just up and left. The first time they got a coffee break about a third of them went out. They thought they were going to jump in jail. That's a fact. They didn't know what it was to punch a time clock.

Now we took another one hundred of the same kind out of the same neighborhood to the same plant, but we gave them a six weeks' orientation course. What does it mean to have a shop steward? A foreman? What is a time clock? What do you do when you come in there? When the coffee break comes, do you run or do you take your drink of coffee? Where do you collect your check? How do you get to the job? How do you act on the job? And we have found that each of those twelve, that every twelve you put what we call, that every ten we put what we call a coach. One man for ten. And 85 out of that one hundred stayed on the job. We can't get employers. Now that is the difference.

All right, next. I know you've got to go and so do I.

Second Question: Mr. Vice President, I come from a poverty stricken county -- a hard-core poverty area. I appreciate deeply the efforts of the poverty program and have tried to be optimistic about it. However, in discussing our particular _______ in one county is very successful and another county invites the workers not to return. I'm wondering if some of the pessimism that we're experiencing and criticizing is not due to the fact that when we talk

about eliminating poverty we are promising too much too soon and many people are critical now because a miracle may not happen. Optimism is wonderful but it also must be measured with realism.

The Vice President: Yes, yes, I couldn't agree with you more. I think there is a tendency for people to overpromise. I don't think that any of us would ever overpromise. I don't think they'll eliminate poverty in my lifetime. I expect to be around a little while, but I do think that you can make progress. I think that every person has an obligation when the Maker calls him to his final days to be able to reflect if he can to say, "Well, I think I helped somebody along the way. I think that I added a little something." I don't think you have to add too much, but a little something. You can do something.

I've said to some of us in public life when we're sitting around alone you know and we get pretty discouraged sometimes.

I said: "You know if I can really feel that the end of the year that I've helped one person, just one person, get out of trouble, make something of him, by golly, that's something."

You know we give people badges, make heroes out of them if they rescue somebody from a river when they're drowning, don't we? Occasionally we even have the President pin on a badge for that.

Well, what about a fellow that's just drowning in his own problems? And you can do something to help him out of it. That's quite an accomplishment.

who

Now I think we/are in government, we have a tendency, you know, because we have to sell it, you know, it's a hard job around here to convince people and there is a tendency to overdo it. But what I'm trying to tell you is that it's a slow process.

We're fighting the cancer of the spirit and we've been trying to get at this cancer of the body, this malignancy, that we call cancer for about fifty years and we haven't discovered the answer yet.

I just lost a brother with it, as you know, but I want to tell you something. You don't condemn the doctor because he doesn't find the answer. You say: "Doctor, does it look like you're coming close?" The doctor said: "Well, the last five

experiments I had failed." "Well, how much did you spend?"

"It cost about 100 million dollars." "Well, doctor how about another half a billion dollars? Will that help?" And I'll tell you why, because out of this room one out of five is going to have it. And one out of three is going to die with it. That's the statistics on cancer. So you're interested. I am. I'll tell you that. I saw a brother in complete and total agony for weeks. Breaking him and breaking my heart.

So I'm for investing in health. I'm for investing in research.

Now what about this kind of business called poverty? We've been having that for as long as man has been on earth, and we may continue to have it, but you can minimize it. Can we take more and more people out of it? And we ought not to oversell it. You're right. a It's/long, costly, painful, arduous task, but it's worth it. It's worth it.

Everytime we get a man off the relief rolls and instead of becoming a tax eater he becomes a tax payer and I want to tell you my fellow tax payers and I, fellow tax payers, that the only society

that can afford poverty is a rich society. And we keep this in mind that for every dollar that the government spends on a training program to get somebody out of poverty or whatever it is, whatever kind of treatment he has to have you'll get it back. If we ever get him on a job, we've got a little machine over there called withholding. And when he gets on that payroll you just give us enough time. The Federal Treasury will get it all back.

Now I'll take one more question and then we're going to go home.

All right, I've got to take two. All right you start.

Third Question: You have indicate	ted that the Poverty
Program is very important. How	?
The Vice President:	a problem
in the family, you have also got to have t	the basic essentials of
your family year in and year out and onc	e in a while an accident
takes place and voulve got to take care o	f that

I would say this: that as far as the Federal Government expenditures are concerned, I'm happy to tell you, very happy

to tell you, we're spending more on the War on Poverty totally in the government than we are on the war in Vietnam. This budget, this year, includes for the people that are dependent or needy or getting aid in education, that is, disadvantaged, the total picture of money, of people receiving any kind of Federal assistance in the poverty group runs to 26 billion dollars. Health, education, social security and all. We're spending about 22 1/2 on the war in Vietnam.

I want to make it quite clear to you that nothing would please me more than if that war were over this afternoon. And even as I speak to you efforts are being made to bring that about.

But I've also got to be very frank with you. I was here when the war in Korea ended. We didn't do anything about poverty. Not one bit. And let me just say to you right now, I know why you're here. You wouldn't be here if you weren't concerned and if you weren't interested citizens in the well being of this country. Be interested when that war is over, because I've been here in Washington a long time. A long, long time and after we finished the war in Korea and we were sending far more there than we are here now and we had 800,000 and 900,000 men there. We have less

than 500,000 in Vietnam. When that war was over, we didn't put a nickel into the eudcation or in the War on Poverty or in anything else. We just put it in our pockets. And we just cut the taxes and we just said, I said, "We're just not going to bother with health, education, or welfare, of anything else."

Now as I've said to my friends that like to picket and I've done a bit of it in my lifetime, too. I'm very tolerant about this.

There have been very few movements that I haven't joined one time or another. But I've said: "Look now when this thing is all over and it's my turn to picket and I put the sign and say: 'Here's Humphrey. Follow me, money for the War on Poverty, resources for education, build better hospitals, clean up the slums, for every dollar in Vietnam a dollar for Americans at home.' "How many of you guys are going to be there? I tried that once before and I want to tell you something. They practically ran me out of Congress.

But I think it will be better next time and I think that one of the things that's coming out of all this ferment in America is the social awareness, now we're beginning to wake up. We don't like the war, we don't like the pain and the trouble of it. I was at a meeting the other day and somebody stood

up in the back and said: "Mr. Vice President, I want you and

President Johnson to know that war in Vietnam is unpopular."

I said: "Hallelujah!" I hope that I never live to see the day that

war is popular because when war gets to be popular around here

that is when you've got to worry. You know that war is unpopular.

We think that we're doing what we have to do. We think
that what we're doing is right. We stand ready to be corrected,
but we also know this and I believe it from the bottom of my heart
that this country is rich enough and strong enough to keep its international commitments and still to take care of the basic needs of the
people back home. We may not be able to do it as fast as we want to
but we can do it.

I'm a family man. I've never been able to give my family as much as I've wanted or as much as they've wanted. I've got a house that's a series of patios enclosed. You know and, my gosh, I never knew what my wife was doing to me. We'd get an open porch and pretty soon she's got it enclosed. You know that's how we built the Humphrey house. And why? That's the only way we could afford it. We couldn't

afford to design a mansion. I wasn't born with a, I didn't even have a spoon in my mouth, much less a silver spoon when I was born. So we had to put it together. We tried to do it piece by piece and that's what we're going to do here.

Now quick, your last question and then let's get out of here.

Fourth Question: Mr. Vice President, my question is
this: When are we going to make it possible for a man who is not
wealthy to run for a high public office without prohibitive controls
or _____? In other words, what has happened to the legislation in Congress and what is the plan of the Administration of how
costly some legislation to _____?

The Vice President: Sir, that legislation has been reported before the Senate Finance Committee. I'm very happy to tell you that there was, I believe, almost, well, not an unanimous report but a very large majority. John, do you rmember that number? Pretty close to unanimous. It has bipartisan support and it provides for appropriations to the two parties and to other parties that get a certain percentage of the vote out of the Federal Treasury for

Presidential campaign expenses and for a certain amount of Congressional campaign expenses.

Now I know that it's going to be given an awful rough time around but let me tell you, you're right. In the long run, it's good. If I never run for office again or no matter what happens, I know it won't be my good luck, I just know that, to have someone pay those campaign bills, but this will be one of the finest things that ever happened to American government. There ought to be a firm lid on how much can be spent and with effective police powers on it, number one, and it can be done.

Number two -- I think that public financing, either by tax deductions or by directly out of the Federal Treasury, is far better than having to go around this country for vast amounts of money that are necessary for a national campaign. Ladies and gentlemen, the amount of money that is required for a national campaign now is just incredible. What is more, most of us are spending most of our time, instead of educating the public during the campaign as we should be trying to, having fund raisers. Fund raisers. Going around trying to find enough money to pay off the bills. We just got, we just this last month, three years after the last election, finished off paying

the bills for the last election. And I would hate to have to tell you how many places I've had to go as Vice President of the United States to speak to groups to put in the caucus to pay off old bills. Imagine what it's like if you get defeated. And I've had that happen, too.

Well, I think I have given the invocation and the benediction,

I'm afraid here today. Thank you very, very much.

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.

