

*write  
thank you*

**KDKA-TV 2**

ONE GATEWAY CENTER PITTSBURGH PENNSYLVANIA 15222 391-3000

RECEIVED

MAR 27 AM 9 51



WBZ-TV BOSTON  
WINS NEW YORK  
KYW-TV PHILADELPHIA  
WJZ-TV BALTIMORE  
KDKA-TV PITTSBURGH  
WOWO FT WAYNE  
WIND CHICAGO  
KPIX SAN FRANCISCO  
KFWB LOS ANGELES

WESTINGHOUSE BROADCASTING COMPANY INC

March 25, 1968

OFFICE OF  
VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. Norman Sherman  
Press Secretary  
Office of Vice President  
Hubert H. Humphrey  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Sherman:

Per your conversations with John Reilly, our program manager, I am enclosing six copies -- the full transcript of "Pennsylvania News Conference" -- which was aired Sunday, March 24, 1968 at 1:00 p.m.

We were most happy to serve as host for Vice President Humphrey for a segment of his stay in Pittsburgh.

Sincerely,

*David H. Baum*

David H. Baum  
Public Relations Director

cc: John Reilly

March 22, 1968

Larry Edwards

KDKA PENNSYLVANIA NEWS CONFERENCE  
Intermin - Pittsburgh

Humphrey: There are two great desires of the American people.

Peace in the world and peace in our cities and both of these desires require a great deal of sacrifice on our part. You can interpret these to be national security and national development. The President of the United States is the number one peace officer of this government, peace at home and peace abroad. His desire is peace with justice. He is the peace candidate at home and in the world.

.....music.....

Burns: Our guest on Pennsylvania News Conference today is the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey. The reporters here today with me are Marie Torre, KDKA-TV and Mark Forrest, KYW-TV, Philadelphia. We begin the questioning with Mark Forrest. Mr Forrest:

Mark Forrest: Mr. Vice President, would you advise the democrats who believe the President of the United States to be the number one peace candidate, to register their support by writing his name in presidential primaries?

Humphrey: Well, wherever there are presidential primaries and wherever there is a slate of delegates pledged to the president, I would hope that there would be active support whether that is by a write-in as it had to be in New Hampshire or whether it was on the basis of the listing of the delegates being under President Johnson's name where you have your voting machines or where you can just mark your "X". Whatever way you can register your support for President Johnson, I want to encourage.

Forrest: Sir, specifically here in Pennsylvania, the only candidate on the ballot is Sen. Eugene McCarthy. Now if the supporters of President Johnson wanted to register their support here, they'd have to do it on a write-in basis. So far the organization here in Pittsburgh and in Philadelphia and statewide feels that they have not had any definite indication of interest on the part of the Whitehouse for mounting such a write-in drive. Would you now say, Sir, that you would like to see that kind of a write-in drive?

Humphrey: Well, I understand that the state committee of the democratic party here has endorsed President Johnson and his candidacy. I am not fully familiar with all the intricate details of each state's primary election laws. As a matter of fact, if there is any one thing that is needed in this country, its uniformity under primary election laws because every state is a separate drama onto its self with a new list of characters and rules and regulations. I don't think that I would be very helpful here by indicating to you what ought to be the preference. May I suggest that you consult with your own state election authorities and our own democratic leaders.

Torre: Mr. Vice President, I heard you say that you liked being Vice President.

Humphrey: Yes.

Torre: Is it possible though that because of the split in the democratic party right now and if President Johnson should decide to run again, that he would seek a new Vice President in the name of political expediency?

Humphrey: Well, I suppose all things are possible, but I don't expect them to be very probable. The President is not prone to lend himself to that kind of political expediency. I can't predict what the future will be. There is only one thing I can tell you. I will try to do as good a job as my talents permit me to during my incumbency as Vice President. I will leave my political fate up to the responsible leaders of the Democratic Party that come to the convention in Chicago in August. I hope that I may be privileged to be the nominee of this party for the office of Vice President. I hope that I can do a good enough job to reassure the President of the United States of my usefulness to him as a Vice President and as a running mate. That's the best that one can do and until then, may I say, I'll do the level best that I am capable of doing and always be happy that I have had the privilege of serving in this high office, whatever the future may hold. So I'm rather confident about the future and let me say, very pleased about the past.

Torre: It would be nice though to have some inside reaction that is, President Johnson's personal reaction to Kennedy-McCarthy.

Humphrey: Well, let me say that I have a pretty good idea of the President's inside reaction as towards Hubert Humphrey, and I sort of stay on that wave length.

Burns: Mr. Vice President, I would like to switch it to the war in Vietnam.

Humphrey: Yes, Sir.

Burns: As we sit here today, more than 20,000 Americans have been killed in Vietnam.

Humphrey: Yes, Sir.

Burns: Our total casualties exceed those of Korea. What do you see as the answer. Now you have stated in Pittsburgh, that the administration is going to take another deep look, looking for possible ways of peace. As we sit here today and your the Vice President, what is the possible answer to Vietnam?

Humphrey: Well, let's say a word first about the casualties and particularly the fatalities. The real tragic loss of this war are not our material resources. We are a very rich nation. Even though the war has been costly, the real tragic irreplaceable loss is the loss of life. And might I say that no person feels more keenly this loss of life except the loved ones themselves, the families, then the President of the United States and even the Vice President. We have to make these decisions. The President makes these decisions of sending men into combat. This is a terrible burden. On the matter of the casualties, I think every parent would be interested to know that the medical care this time in this struggle is the best that the world has ever known. Of the casualties, over 50 percent of them are never even hospitalized. They are minor casualties that are treated as an out-patient and the men go right back to combat. Less than 5 percent of all of the casualties have....well only about 5 percent of them have been severe, let's put it that way. Most of the men, over 85 percent, do return to their units. The capacity of our military now to pick a man up that has been injured in battle and to get

him to a hospital and to proper medical care is nothing short of phenomenal, at the most 30 minutes, and therefore lives are being saved by the thousands where they would have been lost for example in the war in Korea, or in World War II. This at least is a little on the bright side and should be somewhat consoling to those who read that their son may have been injured. Now the constant question that anyone must ask is how much of a price must we pay or can we afford to pay and I've said it quite candidly to you that the price in material goods is not the main burden even though that is costly. The price is in lives, and what is that price being paid for? It's being paid for what we believe is our own national security. We sincerely believe, now somebody may be able to contest this belief, but we sincerely believe and when I say we, the President and his advisors and not just in the government but many outside of the government, believe that the national security of the United States is involved in this struggle. Why? Because if Southeast Asia were to be over run by communist forces, the delicate balance of power in the world today which does preserve the peace as best as it can, does preserve the power relationships between the communist world and the free world. That balance would be very seriously altered. We also believe that the lessons of history teach us that aggression unchecked is aggression unleashed. That aggression that goes unpunished becomes a very bad habit and lends itself to more aggression. That the aggressors appetite has no way of being satisfied. At least this is our belief. Therefore, we say that it is better to take our stand now in Southeast Asia, difficult as it is, than to have to take

our stand someplace else. We don't believe for example as one commentator put it, this war should be fought in Australia or that that's a better place to fight it, or in the Phillipines. We do believe that Armageddon on the installment plan backing up, is no way to secure the peace. We're not fighting a war for the love of war. We're fighting a war for the love of peace. We didn't fight World War II because we wanted war, we fought World War II because there was an aggressor, and because we wanted a peaceful world. We did not fight in Korea because we wanted a war. We fought there because we believed, and I think we were right that if you can check aggression in the Korean Peninsula, you might be sure of a more peaceful and secure Asia, and particularly as it related to Japan. Now all of these are human judgments. We may be in error. We do not think so and neither did President Eisenhower, neither did President Kennedy. President Kennedy made it manifestly clear that he thought our stand in Vietnam was absolutely vital to our national security, so did President Eisenhower and so has President Johnson. Now I happen to believe, my friends, that three presidents with all of the advisors that they had and , if they had, cannot be so wrong and I also find that the leaders in South Asia and Southeast Asia, the free leaders, everyone of them without exception, believes that our stand in Vietnam is vital to their independence and their hope of freedom. Even the critics like the Prime Minister of Singapore, who has not been particularly friendly to the United States in some of his comments, said that the hope for freedom and independence in

Asia rested with American success in Vietnam, and I think that what's happened in Indonesia indicates again the importance of our being there. Not that we saved Indonesia but that our presence in Southeast Asia gave the Indonesians the chance to save themselves. I can document this case and tell you that in July, 1965 when we entered Vietnam, Thailand was under attack, half of Laos had already been conquered by the communists, Burma was under attack and hundreds of thousands of weapons were being shipped into Indonesia for the final blow on Indonesia itself. Today Indonesia is free of communism. Today Thailand is a stronger country. Today Southeast Asia has a hope of freedom.

Torre: Well, why do you think, Mr. Vice President, that there are so many Americans who do not share this view on Vietnam?

Humphrey: Because I think they do not understand all the facts. I think possibly it's a failure of our own communication. No one likes war.

Burns: Well don't you think Mr. Vice President, there is a possibility that President Johnson and his advisors could be wrong on Vietnam? That this could be a sink hole that goes on for years, 10 or 15 years.

Humphrey: There are always those that say there could be that possibility. We are putting the judgment of people against... well, one group of people against another...but I would just put in on this basis that when the government of Australia, of New Zealand, of Indonesia, of Malasia, of the Phillipines, of Korea, of Tiawan, of Thailand, all of these governments and our own feel that this is a vital struggle for freedom and independence that when three presidents of the United States, I don't have



the time to read the quotations of President Eisenhower but he made it crystal clear and even does to this day, the importance of our involvement there and of our stand there and when President Kennedy in response to inquiry after inquiry made it manifestly clear that we must take our stand there. There is no doubt about that, no doubt at all, and may I say that even Senator Robert Kennedy in his visits to Siagon in late 1962 said we must be here and we will be here and we will win here. He went further, may I say, than some others have. It's an interesting thing that those who have been there the least, seem to have the greatest opposition to our involvement, in general, now there are some that have been there that are opposed to our involvement there's no doubt about it, but by the way very few of them recommend withdrawal. All of them have some little adaptation that they think we ought to try. Some of them I think really believe in withdrawal but they dare not say it, but they have withdrawal symptoms, and I think that is very, very dangerous.

Forrest: Mr. Vice President, since you obviously feel so strongly on the issue of Vietnam and do does the President, don't you feel that it is encumbant on him as a leader of the Democratic Party as well as a leader of the nation to submit this case to the voters and primaries such as Wisconsin and California?

Humphrey: This case will be submitted to the voters in the general election. Now Mark, you're a wise and good man. There are very few state primaries and there are very few that mean very much and you know it and I know it. You know the time for frank talk is at hand. A lot of these primaries are any thing but a real

election. Some of them are preference primaries. Some of them can't even describe. I have gone through the primary route. You're talking to an old primary hand, and I must say one that has a few scars on his back because of them. I wish that we had a national primary law. I think it would maybe be helpful although it is very costly. The truth of the matter is that the selection of a president in this country for a political party does not rest in the state primaries and every state primary is different and everyone of them has a different meaning. Sometimes you're pledged, sometimes its preference, sometimes its just popularity contest. Most all of them are very costly and what they really do is provide new copy. Most of it is good copy for the newspapers, radio and television, and they're all very interesting by the way. But the nomination of the President of the United States will be in convention and three fourths of the convention delegates are not primary delegates that are controlled by primaries.

Burns: Just the same, Mr. Vice President, didn't Senator McCarthy showing New Hampshire sort of raise the administration's eyebrows a little more than somewhat?

Humphrey: Oh, there's nothing that gives you such a sense of the importance of the struggle as a good contest. I have always believed in the competitive system. It just proves the importance of competition. But, let's get the record clear, I keep reading about how Mr. McCarthy won in New Hampshire. He didn't win. The majority of the vote in the Democratic primary was for

President Johnson. I even read how he won in Minnesota. Now I'll settle any time in an election for over 60 percent of the vote and in the state of Minnesota, the Johnson foreces gained well over 60 percent of the delegates in the precinct caucuses. Now, you can go ahead and say you won but you have to have the votes to believe that you won.

Forrest: Sir, can you envision any circumstances politically at this time that would cause President Johnson not to seek re-nomination and re-election?

Humphrey: No, I can envision none, Sir.

Burns: We will be back with Pennsylvania News Conference right after this message.

-----

Burns: We resume Pennsylvania News Conference and our guest today, the Vice President of the United States, Hubert H. Humphrey. The question comes from Marie Torre.

Torre: Mr. Vice President, to get off of Vietnam for a while, the report from the President's commission on civil disorders has been out for a while. Why hasn't the President acted on it?

Humphrey: But the President has acted on it. The President has ordered, first of all, the members of his cabinet to examine every aspect of that report to see what programs we now have...

Torre: Another report on a report?

Humphrey: The President has acted on the report of the National Commission on Civil Disorders. His actions is as follows:

Humphrey: First, the cabinet meeting at which the President asked each member of his cabinet to examine the Commission's report in terms of the programs that are going on now in our government and to see how those programs apply to the recommendations of the Commission and to step up those programs as best we can through proper administration and through better administration. Secondly, to take a look at the Commission report and to see what else we need to do in terms of legislative proposals or administrative actions. So there is no lack of interest in the report. Now the report was not an obituary of America, it was a health report and some of us in looking it over, and I have looked it over very carefully, believe that it offers many constructive proposals and at the same time it warns the American Nation of the condition of its political and social health which needs repair and which needs remedial action. I happen to think the report is one of the most constructive documents that has been prepared by any Commission and it has our great attention. In fact, many of the things in the report that has been suggested we are already doing. Other things will need to be done in larger measures or as to put it in larger doses. We commend the report.

Torre: Well, basically it calls for huge expenditures of money to alleviate poverty and yet there was an interesting contradiction out just the other day but a 135,000 dollar study of the Detroit riots of last summer was made by a psychiatrist and what he found was that most of the Negroes who were involved in those riots earned between \$115-\$120 per week which is hardly poverty status.

Humphrey: This is why the Vice President said that some of the observations of the report were open to challenge that didn't mean that you opposed the report. I don't believe there are any simple answers to the problem of disturbances in our cities. I think we've learned that. We hardly even know what causes them much less how we remedy them. This is a sort of a sickness at the present time in our society but it is one that seems to lend itself to certain treatments and we are trying to experiment today. This is one of the things that we are doing. Trying to find out how do you get people out of poverty. How do you prepare a broken spirit? You know it isn't just by checkbooks that we do this and I'm glad you brought this up, Marie, because some people feel that the answer to all of our urban problems is just larger expenditures of federal funds. May I say quite candidly, that the first requirement is a great commitment on the part of the people in the community to do a better job for themselves. To overcome prejudice not only by law but by action and by habit, to open up this society to the people who have been left out, to be willing to talk and consult with the poor, to bring them on in. It isn't just money. If it were only money, may I say we are spending about three times much money right now in our war on poverty and in our cities as we did some three or four years ago. I happen to think that we are making some great breakthroughs. I'm one of those persons in America that believes that this restlessness is not a sign of decay but it is a sign of hope. You know when people see no hope they are not restless, it's when they see light at the end of the tunnel when they see a chance

that they become much more anxious, much more urgent, much more restless. They want to get there faster and I think that's what we are seeing here today. I'm going to talk a little bit about this while I'm here in Pittsburgh.

Burns: Mr. Vice President, getting back to the political stage, the young people apparently seem to be supporting Senator McCarthy and somewhat Senator Kennedy...how would you evaluate the young people?

Humphrey: We have not done well by them and have not done enough for them. I think the opposition of the young people is based around the war in Vietnam. I regret this because many of the young people who seem to be doing this have draft deferments and live a better life than they have for many years. I hope that they can. This is one of the purposes of our society and I'm not being critical. I'd like to have more of an opportunity to speak to them. I do a great deal and have a wonderful reception, I might add, standing ovations. We hear about the pickets on the outside and not the reception on the inside. I'm not worried about the pickets, I'm worried about what the young people are thinking. They are concerned, they are healthy active people. And when we tell them our story, they will be much more receptive, for example, I think young people want all Americans to have equal opportunity. No administration has done as much to open the gates of opportunity than the Johnson Administration and one of the reasons President Johnson has had opposition is because he has struck down the walls of segregation and has been able to do things that other presidents were unable or unwilling

to do. There's no doubt about that. I think young people will really appreciate our administration when they see that what we are really engaged in is the development of human resources. We're willing to spend thousands of dollars on the rehabilitation of one person. When I was in Europe, I told this to the young people there and they found it hard to believe that we were willing to spend several thousand dollars to train one person for one job. Many of our critics say we spend too much...the young people say we don't spend enough. We think we're pacing it as well as we can in light of our many burdens. I'd like to say to the young people that the reason we are taking our stand in Vietnam today is so that young people in the years to come won't have to take this stand.

Burns: That what we were told in World War II, Mr. Vice President.

Humphrey: Yes, and we've had a period of relative peace considering the dangers in the world. We've not had a nuclear conflict. I think it's fair to say that had we not taken a firm stand against the Soviet Union and its expansionist policies immediately after World War II, we might very well today have had a more serious struggle...and let me say another word about peace keeping. This administration kept the peace in the Mediterranean in the Cyprus dispute...this President has tried to keep the peace in the Middle East...working day and night to do so...we tried to keep the peace in the Caribbean. We think we've done a lot of peace keeping. We signed a treaty to ban the weapons of mass destruction being in outer space and orbital flight. We're the authors of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty. President Johnson has not signed a



single treaty which has committed this country to war. But we have signed one treaty that committed this country to keeping down nuclear weaponry. We're trying to create channels of trade to promote peace. We've expanded our Peace Corps. We've done many things in the cause of peace and that's why I say that President Johnson is indeed the Peace President. Neville Chamberlain was not the peace Prime Minister of Great Britain. He was the war Prime Minister. Winston Churchill was the peace Prime Minister of Great Britain. He took the stand, that had it been followed, there maybe could have been peace on the continent of Europe. He was the man who fought for the integrity of Britain and history will record that he was one of the great architects of peace. Abraham Lincoln was the peace president in the war between the states. He tried to keep the peace and he kept the union together. I think there are some analogies here that have a relevance in history.

kld



HUMPHREY 10 MIN. NEWS CONFERENCE AT KDKA-TV

March 22, 1968

Discipline of questions and hopefully the discipline of some short answers. Yes sir?

Question - Mr. Humphrey can you spell out, please sir, of the intensive review of the peace effort which they make.

I think that the statement speaks for itself. I leave it just exactly as that point, it has been Secretary Rusk, of course, before the Committee on foreign relations has told that committee which I have reiterated that the American effort in Viet Nam both in terms of the military and the diplomatic effort to bring about a negotiated settlement is under review from A to Z, and I put it under an intensive review.

Question - Something to do about President Johnson...

President Johnson and Vice President Humphrey seem to be working together quite well.

Question - Thers an old saying, Mr. Vice President, that in unity there is strength, the Republican Party seemingly has that unity at the moment, especially in view of Governor Rockefeller's announcement yesterday. The Democratic Party does not seem to have it, how would you estimate the effect of the election on this ~~devic~~ceivness.

A. Well, the Republican Party as a minority party can always stand a larger dose of early unity than we can, it sustains its life for the big battle that takes place in the general election. The Democratic Party has always indulged in the luxury of a certain amount of internal dissension and internal debate and on occasion conflict, but we have a unique quality which has stood us very well throughout our history, being able to bind up at least enough of the wounds to come through in the general election and it is my hope that we will be able to do that. It is my hope that those who protest President Johnson's leadership now, contest him for the nomination, will re-

member that they are Democrats, will remember that their success politically has been within the home of the Democratic Party, and will remember that the Democratic Party has served this nation well and if they remember that I haven't any doubt as to the outcome of 1968.

Question - This is your hope, but you can't say for sure.

Well, people who try to predict with certainty put themselves out of what I would call the human quality into what I would call just a higher level and I stay with the human.

Question - Mr. Vice President, do you feel that President Johnson should change his pre-convention strategy and become an active campaigner against Senator Kennedy and Senator McCarthy?

A. The President is the President of the United States, hes not a candidate, the greatest service the President can do to and for this country is to serve as the Chief Executive, to serve as President, to fulfill to the best of his great abilities the responsibilities of this high office and thats exactly what I expect him to do. Some of the rest of us will have to undertake some of the campaign responsibilities, I have over the years as you know tried to carry the message of our governement and our administration tothe American people, I will continue to do so. I also have a number of responsibilities which I feel necessary to fulfill. The best politics, truthfully, is no politics. The best politics is public service, tending to your responsibilities fulfilling them well, and giving the national leadership. Thats exactly what the President will do.

Question - Mr. V. P. yo u have compared the problem with the Democratic Party at the moment with the situation 20 years ago when Mr. Truman was a candidate and there was a split in the party. Is it really the same sir , we didn't have the Viet Nam issue at that time.

A. No, but we had an issue that was every bit as D.I.V.I.C.I.S.I.V.E. We had a bitter

fight over American Foreign Policy, I was involved in it in Minnesota. My party in Minnesota came into being in 1946, the Democratic Farmer Labor Party. It was, I mean in 1944. It was literally destroyed in 1946 with the left-wing elements in the old farmer labor party taking full command and in 1948 we had a knock-down, drag-out convention battle at every precinct, ward and county level in the state convention and it was over the issue of foreign policy, over the Truman Doctrine, over the policy of containment, over President Truman's firm stand against Communist Expansion in Europe. Very much the same issue, but in a different part of the world and we went on to gain a tremendous victory. I help lead that fight, Orvel Freeman was my partner the President's Secretary of Agriculture, we went on to carry out that fight, and I think there's a great deal of similarity. Not identical history never repeats itself in all of its particulars, but there's some lesson to draw from it and as you recall in 1948 the opposition to President Truman was not content to merely fight within the party, went on outside the party and set up the progressive party, and by the way the Chairman of the Progressive Party was from Minnesota the former governor, Elmer Benson. One of the most popular figures in Minnesota was the candidate Henry Wallace, and then you also had the Dixiecrat Party, you had Strom Thurmond, so you have today George Wallace with his political apparatus and operation that is essentially based upon the principals of segregation. You have today the so-called new left, some of it is operative within the Democratic party some of it is operative outside of the Democratic party there is some similarity not necessarily complete identity.

Question - Does there seem to be more hope now for the President's sur-tax program?

A. I hope so, I think this is a vital necessity. I would say the most important issue before the Congress of the United States today is the issue of fiscal responsibility which is based upon the necessity of the Congress

passing a very modest tax increase, 1¢ on each taxed dollar it will do more to help this country in terms of its economy, to help pay for the bills that we are getting for our cities and for this war. That tax is to help pay for the cost of the War = to help to pay for the cost of the rehabilitation of our cities - to curb the threat of inflation to protect the value of the dollar and to keep this economy moving forward and for the Congress to delay in the passage of this tax is to threaten all of these great efforts.

Question - Mr. Vice President, Mr Nixon claims that if elected President that he would end the war in Viet Nam. What does he know sir that you people don't know apparently?

A. We've been trying to find out and let me put it right on the line. If anyone knows how to end that war with any degree of honor without America running away from its responsibilities without America withdrawing in defeat if anyone knows how to end that war on honorable terms he has a solemn sacred high obligation to present that information to this governemtn. Because this government is looking for every way that it can find to bring about an honorable peace in Viet Nam.

Question - Mr. Vice President why dont' we extend an invitation to Mr. Nixon so that we can find out what he has in mind?

A. Mr. Nixon is always welcome at any level of government except as an elected official.

Question - Senator Clark has opposition in the primary in Pennsylvania. Do you think that Senator Clark will be re-nominated?

These are matters that the State Committee takes care of I am out here to be of some help I hope to President Johnson and to the national administration

Question - Mr. V. P. ~~will~~ were you personally ~~delighted by Rockefeller's pull-out?~~

A. Well, quite candidly, I didn't have much reaction one way or the other. I thought that was a matter for the Republicans to settle. I have many friends

in the Republican party and many social friends but when it comes to election here they seldomly counsel with me as to what they ought to do and in fact they generally appreciate my keeping somewhat away from them. The decision Mr. Rockefeller made was his own decision I'm sure after very careful consultation in the ranks of his party, whatever they do is their business, what we do will be the nations business because we really plan to going on and winning this election.

Question - Will this withdrawal help Mr. Johnson's chances in November Mr. Humphrey.

A. I don't think it has harmed him.

Question - Mr. Rockefeller also turned down the possibility of running for the office of Vice President, whats wrong with that job?

A. Asked Mr. Rockefeller, I like it. In fact, I've made it quite clear from time to time that I've enjoyed the position, I find it a position of responsibility and honor and I hope that I will be able to fulfill both of those requirements.

Question - Will plans for austerity cut into the program for the ghetto?

A. Well, unless we can get our tax bill through, our, all of our programs will be threatened. It is imperative that we start to pay our bills. Now the American people have had three tax reductions in the last four years. You cannot ~~oooo~~ step us as we have your programs, education and health in urban redevelopment as much as 300% as we have done so, we've tripled these programs in the last four years without paying the bill. Now if you want to build a better American if you want to fulfill for example some of the requirements of the recent report on civil disorders a report that I considered to be constructive, forthright and presenting a program that this nation needs very badly if you want to do that you've got to have the funds. You just can't go along on borrowed time and borrowed money. Now we can afford

these things, we have an economy of over \$800 billion dollars the most prosperous economy that the world's ever known, that prosperity is threatened if we become reckless with our fiscal matters and therefore we're asking for a modest tax bill to give us some degree of fiscal responsibility.

Question - There's been some talk, Mr. Vice President of a possible summit meeting with the Soviet Union, do you know anything about that?

A. No, I do not and the success of those meetings are usually predicated on the least amount of talk prior to them. Diplomacy is a delicate business, successful diplomacy is even more delicate.

Question - Where are we sure on the Pueblo?

A. Just where we were. An unsolved matter, but at least the commotion over it has cooled down somewhat fortunately, the effort of our government to maintain a degree of calmness in the area I think has <sup>VE</sup> been fruitful, our diplomacy still continues to seek the release of that crew and the return of that ship. We have yet to exhaust all of the diplomatic efforts even up to the World Court itself.

Question - ~~We~~ will get them back though?

A. It is my hope, it is our intention.

Question - Mr. Vice President, your <sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> going into Wisconsin today, can you tell us now what the President's strength is in numerical terms, what percentage of the vote will his delegates get?

A. Well, <sup>profits</sup> ~~profits~~ are generally without honor in their own country and ~~profits~~ and politics are entering a very precarious business I made broad <sup>ONE</sup> ~~proficiencies~~ <sup>profits</sup>, but detailed <sup>profits</sup> ~~proficiencies~~ even on weather these days have been head somewhat. You notice that the weatherman used to say that it was either going to rain or it was going to be sun shiny, now he says its 40\$ rain or 80%, he hedges. I hedge here a little bit too. I've been in Wisconsin as you know I have a little bit of experience there. I think this is a very difficult fight for us. Re-

publican cross-over and my friend Senator McCarthy has asked for a republican cross-over, could very well have a very serious effect upon the administration, the Johnson ticket. It is not unusual for our republican friends in Wisconsin when they have an uncontested primary in their primary to indulge themselves in a little political <sup>generosity</sup> ~~gainsmanship~~ over in the Democratic precincts. This is an old habit that started a long time ago and when a candidate asks for a Republican cross-over into the Democratic primary you can rest assured that the invitation will be looked upon kindly. So, I think we can clearly understand that one, there will be a republican cross-over that the republican cross-over will not be to the benefit of President Johnson. I think we ought to understand that there is a <sup>very</sup> ~~ver~~, very vocal and active group of opponents to the President in Wisconsin so its going to be a very hard fight. I can't predict its outcome except that we'll do the best we can. At best let me say that its nip and tuck.



# Minnesota Historical Society

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

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



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