

Transcript of remarks by Vice-President
Hubert H. Humphrey to the New Jersey Convention
Delegates, at the Brunswick Inn, East Brunswick,
New Jersey, on Thursday, August 15, 1968, at
4:45 p.m.

George A. Sakson
Certified Shorthand Reporter

I N D E X

	<u>Page</u>
Governor Richard J. Hughes	4
The Vice-President	8
Question and Answer Period	23

MR. ROBERT J. BURKHARDT: Ladies and Gentlemen, will the meeting please be in order?

Here comes the Vice-President, ladies and gentlemen.

(Standing ovation)

MR. BURKHARDT: The meeting will be in order.

Mr. Vice-President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am delighted to welcome you here on behalf of the Democratic State Committee of New Jersey. This is the second meeting of its type that we have held this year. Senator McCarthy was here, Mr. Vice-President, a couple of weeks ago in this very room, and we are delighted to have you here with us today.

Before I introduce Governor Hughes, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to make one announcement about the details of the convention and the traveling arrangements.

All of you have been sent the appropriate forms and information. We have two chartered planes that will leave on Sunday, the 25th, at 11 o'clock in the morning. You have been given your seat and plane assignments. The planes, however, instead of going to Midway Airport in Chicago, as we had contemplated, will go to O'Hare. This is the official greeting place of all the delegations and it is

far easier for the people in Chicago to take us there, and the appropriate transportation will be engaged to move us from O'Hare to the Palmer House.

I have been deluged, as I know you have, with requests for information on tickets, passes and so forth. An Arrangements Committee meeting of the Democratic National Committee will be held this Friday in Chicago. New Jersey's representative on that Arrangements Committee, Mrs. Thelma Sharp, our National Committeewoman, will be in attendance. At that time an announcement will be made about the availability of credentials. We cannot answer any questions about them because we don't know how many tickets we are going to have or anything else of that sort. But as soon as this information is available, you will be advised.

And for your information, when we reach Chicago credentials will be passed out in the Palmer House at the caucus room that you will be notified of, between 9 a.m. and 12 noon on Monday.

And now, as always, it's a great pleasure and a rare privilege to introduce the Governor of the State of New Jersey, the Honorable Richard J. Hughes.

(Standing ovation)

GOVERNOR RICHARD J. HUGHES: Thank you very much, Bob.

Mr. Vice-President, Distinguished Guests: In order to save the time of the Vice-President, who does New Jersey such great honor to come here to be with us today and to visit around on an informal basis and to chat, which I know he loves to do, with his fellow Democrats about the future of the country and the future of the world, I want to tell you that I appreciate very much the efforts put forth by Bob Burkhardt and all those others who cooperated.--I know who they are; I am not going to take the time to name them all --in gathering this meeting together. It's been a nice reception. We left a wonderful one a little while ago in Newark at which time I heard the Vice-President give, in my judgment, the best speech certainly in my recollection and possibly the best speech that he's ever given -- a wonderful talk which breathed out the hope and the aspirations of the American dream and which showed just what kind of zeal and fervor this man has for his country and for the world.

I mentioned there something that may or may not become relevant this year, now, although I had always admired Hubert Humphrey, I never came to have that kind of affectionate respect that in a case would be almost equivalent to love

and admiration for one man to another as the time in 1960 when I saw him, as many of you no doubt did, saying good-bye to all the ashes of his dreams in the little hotel room in West Virginia the night that he was decisively beaten in that primary by John F. Kennedy. And this is the kind, I think, and the stamp of a man that he is; this is what really sold me on this great American -- the fact that as he put on his hat and choked back his tears and knew that this was the end of his hope to run for the presidency of the United States, no Democrat, no American went to work more promptly and more vigorously and more generously for the election of John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson than did Hubert Humphrey. That's the kind of man he is. (Applause)

And it's the honest desire of the Democratic party in New Jersey, as I know you share, that that is the reason why the bulk, the majority of this delegation has remained uncommitted and honestly uncommitted during these times. There have been several candidates, 19, who are elected, they are committed to Senator McCarthy, and there may be one or more others who have decided to support Senator McCarthy, at the same time there are some members of our delegation who have been quoted as saying they support the Vice-President.

The purpose of the non-commitment is for the

purpose of preserving the house of the Democratic party in New Jersey so that when we come to November and when the fate of our cities, the fate of our country and, indeed, the fate of the world, world peace, generations of our children yet unborn might very well depend on the election of a Democratic President, I want New Jersey to be in the Democratic electoral column, and unless we stay together, unless we have the generous unity in which people can argue and can argue in principle but leaving aside bitterness and hard words and come together for the greater objective -- don't forget, we have both an affirmative reason this year. When Chicago is over and the Democratic candidate for President comes out, he will stand upon the edifice of decency built into this nation's life since the early days of the New Deal in the early 1930's. He will have all these things to fight for, he will have all these things to preserve, and he will have all these things by his energy, by his experience to magnify as America faces and this world faces more difficult years even than those days of bitter worldwide depression.

And at that time we have a negative reason also because we have seen a new Nixon, who is really the old Nixon with a Madison Avenue face. A little more patience, a

little less quarreling with the press, a little ambiguity, but it's still within the principle of the Republican candidate for President to go into a back room and let Strom Thurmond, who left the convention at Philadelphia because of the zeal for civil rights of this man who sits on my right and tried to dissolve and wreck the Democratic Party. (Applause) Let Strom Thurmond with all that he represents in America pick his vice-presidential candidate for him, and that's why I say we will have a great negative impulse to defeat this man and his ticket and his ideology of going backward and down rather than going forward and up, which the Democratic Party will be placing again, as it always has, before this country of ours.

I think no greater honor could have come to me in my time as Governor than the opportunity to present to you, without further ado because this is his meeting, this is his time for your questions and answers and your discussion with him -- the Vice-President of the United States.

(Standing Ovation)

THE VICE-PRESIDENT: Thank you very much.

Thank you, Governor Hughes. Thank you for once again for being so gracious and generous with your comments and also for giving us the sort of spirit in which this wonderful meeting can be conducted.

I want to express my thanks to your National Committeewoman, your National Committeeman, Chairman, my friend Bob Burkhardt, and of course to all of you.

I come here today as a fellow Democrat. I prefer to use my energies, if it's humanly possible, really on the real opposition rather than upon each other. I think most of you know that the two contenders outside of myself for the nomination of the Democratic Party are long time firends of mine. I do not intend to spend any time downgrading their efforts or casting any reflection upon them in any way that would not be complimentary.

I helped bring George Mc Govern into politics. I was the first man that asked him to run for office. I campaigned for him. South Dakota is my native State. My father served in that State's Legislature for years with distinction. He was the leader in the Democratic Party in that State. George McGovern was my neighbor for twelve years in Washington, D. C. -- next door. We grew up together, our

families. I admire him. I like him. I think he is a fine citizen. I think he is a good Senator. I want to see him re-elected to the Senate. And if he is nominated as President, he will have my support. It's just that simple. (Applause)

I have known Senator McCarthy since 1948. We helped build the party together out in Minnesota. I have been his colleague in the Senate. He served for several years in the House of Representatives and then in 1952 was elected to the United States Senate. We campaigned together. We have been together. We have been to conventions together. He's nominated me at conventions. How could I say anything unkind about Senator McCarthy? I don't intend to have twenty years of friendship destroyed on the anvil of political ambition and political contest in a pre-convention struggle. It's too hard to get a good ticket. (Applause)

I know that the Senators have had strong convictions. If I didn't believe they had strong convictions, I wouldn't have been their friend. I have them, too. I have tried to serve my country, my party and this world as a private citizen, as a parent, and as a public official.

Maybe I should just take a few moments to present my credentials. The first thing I'd like to say to you is that I have served the cause of progressive democracy

and liberalism to the best of my ability as I understood it ever since I have been in public life.

Adlai Stevenson once said that liberalism is not the sudden, frenzied emotional outburst, but the dedication of a lifetime. And I think of that fine and noble spirit of Adlai Stevenson -- and he was my dear friend. I was privileged to go to London to bring back his remains; to be with his family at the moment of the burial of his body. I think Adlai Stevenson lent a sense of dignity to this Democratic Party during our off years, those lean years from 1953 to 1961 that have stood us well. And this man had a way of capsuling in words basic philosophy and basic truth. And it is a fact that the cause of liberalism like patriotism itself is not served by just a sudden, emotional, frenzied outburst. It is served by dedication, commitment, a long time faithfully, during good times and bad times.

I came into politics as the Mayor of my city, the City of Minneapolis, a city of over a half million people. I came into a city that was known as the second most anti-Semitic city in America. I came into a city that was corrupt, known as such. I was a very young man. I had the support of organized labor and the Democratic Party and some of my young friends that were fellow students of

mine, and university professors, housewives -- just friends. The group that I had organized they called Humphrey's Diaper Brigade. We were idealistic, we were hard-working, and we had courage. We also tried to have commonsense.

I learned a long time ago that history is strewn with the wreckage that has been consummated by self-appointed, self-righteous minorities who thought they had a monopoly on truth. There is nothing so dangerous as dogma and doctrine that leaves no room for tolerance or reason.

I never thought that I had a monopoly on either virtue or wisdom. I have sought to learn, and life should be an experience of growth. It should be a maturing process.

When I came in as a young man as Mayor I set out to do something for my people in the city, the people that I represented and the city that I served. And I'm proud to tell you that we did some things. The first municipal fair employment practices ordinance in the United States with power and enforcement power. The first Human Relations Commission. A city that after three years of leadership received the annual national award of the Conference of Christians and Jews for the Brotherhood Award. A city that reorganized its schools, its police department.

The first war on poverty. Ninety per cent of our relief clients were trained, rehabilitated and employed, just like we are doing now, for the labor movement and the Chamber of Commerce and the industrial establishment of my city were called in by the Mayor, twenty years ago, and said that welfarism is no answer. We'll have a decent welfare program for those who need it and we'll have jobs for those who can work. And through our adult education, our vocational education program, our Dunwoodie Institute our Mechanical Arts Institute and others we set out and trained our people and they were employed.

We set up the first Alcoholism Institute for those that are victims of that affliction.

We did a lot of things. We completed the first community self-survey to take a look at our city because I've always believed that the ultimate purpose of organized society was the enhancement of human dignity.

You know, we talk about those basic rights, those God-given unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and I hope you will remember all three words. As once in a while I have received my fair share of criticism when I've said that we ought to pursue the politics of happiness. That's the purpose of life, ladies and

gentlemen, to try to get some kind of harmony between man and his Maker, man and his neighbor so he can live in happiness. That's what it's all about. And we have tried, as a country, not only to protect life but to give meaning to life. That's what a democracy is all about. And to do it in the spirit of brotherhood or at least of tolerance and understanding and to try to somehow and another enrich the human personality, the human spirit and the human being.

Well, I went on to the Congress. I was the first elected United States Senator from Minnesota in a hundred years -- the first -- and I served sixteen years in that Senate.

I saw some Job Corps boys outside here. I fought for eight years to get a Job Corps Program. Passed the bill three times in the Senate. I was an initiator. As a matter of fact, many people said I had more solutions than there were problems. And now I hear a few people say that he has no solutions and doesn't recognize the problems. My, what a switch!

I'm proud of the fact that I have taken my stand all of my life on what I believed was right. I'm not always sure that I am right, but I try to find out what's right. And if I find I'm wrong, I hesitate not to

change my mind.

Your Governor mentioned my efforts in 1960. I might mention that in 1960 I received 44 per cent of the vote in the State of Wisconsin and I did not call it a victory. I received 42 per cent of the vote in the State of West Virginia and I was defeated. I won the primary in the District of Columbia. I had some 290 delegates pledged to me but I felt that after the West Virginia primary that my case was not coming along well, that the people did not feel that I should carry the banner of this party and I therefore withdrew. And I am happy to tell you that the only state outside of Missouri and Illinois, between the Appalachians and the West Coast, that went for John Kennedy was the State of Minnesota in 1960. (Applause)

I carried that State by 275,000 votes and President Kennedy carried it by 22,000. I campaigned every place in that State and around the country for him. And when he asked me if I would be willing to serve as one of his leaders in the Congress, I said "yes," and I was his majority whip in the Senate of the United States for all the thousand days of his great administration. And many of the great laws that are on the statute books today, because he got this country moving again because he cared, we

helped get on the statute books. Maybe that's the reason that today a man like Larry O'Brien is my campaign manager and court leader because he was there.

Well, I served John Kennedy as faithfully as I could and I served my party. I'm a Democrat. I fought for the Democratic Party. I have been up here fighting for the Democratic Party. I've traveled across this country a hundred and one times for candidates of the Democratic Party because I believe that the Democratic Party on balance, with all of its inadequacies, has best served the national interest. I think this is a better country because we governed as much as we had. I think this is a better world because we had Democratic administrations in power. And I think that in 1968 we are going to make a very important decision because we are going to decide in 1968 whether or not the people were right in 1960 when Kennedy defeated Nixon, and we are going to have to decide in 1968 whether or not Mr. Nixon ought to be President of the United States or whether or not a Democrat ought to be President of the United States. And I can't imagine that anybody that believes in social progress, that anybody that believes in liberalism, that anybody that believes in trying to build a better world can desert this Party when it is faced with a tremendous chal-

lenge. And we have a real battle on our hands, make no mistake about it.

In 1964 I went to Atlantic City. I was offered, tendered the nomination of the Vice-Presidential office. I was never so honored in my life. I've had sixteen years of fairly good service in the Senate. I'll never forget the day I received the nomination and the evening that I gave my acceptance speech. And just as I served John Kennedy faithfully as well as I could as his floor leader in the Senate, I have served faithfully and loyally, which I consider the minimum requirements of a Vice-President, the present President of the United States. (Applause)

And I have not only served the President, I have served the country. I traveled on four continents, 30 countries, and all 50 states. I have gone to foreign countries to help negotiate a non-proliferation treaty on nuclear weapons; the Kennedy round on trade; the International Monetary Agreement on international finance. I have tried to serve the interests of this country and the people.

I know there are differences amongst us, but let me say that those differences primarily center around what we consider to be the objectives of our nation in Southeast Asia. I don't duck the question at all. Three

Presidents thought that we had some interest in that area of the world, thought that area of the world affected our national interest -- President Eisenhower, President Kennedy and President Johnson. None of them could have foreseen the degree of our involvement, but all of them knew the risks, that there were risks. But each of them understood that the risks of doing nothing were greater than the risks of doing something. Our objective there has never been conquest. I see signs that speak of the ugliness and the tragedy of war. Of course, Sherman said it, war is hell, and it's dirty business, but so is terrorism, conquest, tyranny, dictatorship. And I never thought that there was a black and white so clear an issue in South and North Vietnam, but I have thought that our national interests were involved.

What has been the objective of this Administration? What was the objective of the previous Administration? A political settlement. Just as we seek to work out our differences at home peacefully, we had hoped and prayed we could work them out peacefully abroad. And I think that when you take a good look you will see that there is substantial evidence to support this.

This Administration in the nuclear test ban treaty has done more to protect the lives of citizens yet

unborn than any administration in the history of this country.
(Applause)

I am one of the co-authors of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. When John Kennedy signed that treaty he looked to me, and it's in public print, he said, "Hubert, this is your treaty." I dared to be for it when others were afraid.

The non-proliferation treaty that I speak of prevents the spread of nuclear weapons. The greatest danger in this world today is not the war in Vietnam; it's the arms race. The greatest danger in the world today is the contest between the super powers, between the development of deadly weapons systems like the fractional orbital weapons system, like the new intercontinental ballistics missiles and the anti-ballistics missiles systems that can consume billions and billions of dollars of people's treasury and the resources of nations. And we are trying to slow down the arms race. That's why the preliminary negotiations are underway for what we call defensive and offensive weapons to kind of cut back the non-proliferation treaty to put a ceiling upon nuclear power.

I am the author of the Arms Control Act, ladies and gentlemen. I sponsored it, got it through the

Congress and was present when it was signed. I am the author of the Food for Peace Act. I am the Author of the Peace Corps.

I have been a peace man allmy life. I have never advocated violence at home or abroad. But just as I have never advocated violence, I do believe that you cannot afford to let violence become the pattern at home or abroad, either place. (Applause)

So we have taken our stand. This is the issue which tends to divide us. We are now at a point where hopefully and prayerfully we can find a resolution of this issue. It will do us little good to argue about the yesterday. Some people think we were terribly wrong. I respect their point of view. Only history is going to be able to judge this, only history, the objectivity of time. We are too emotionally involved in the current struggle to have an honest objective judgment and I suppose I am incapable of giving one and I think the critics are incapable frankly of giving one.

I remember the days of the Korean war -- a miserable period -- but I happen to think now that Mr. Truman is a rather strong and popular man. I know of no man in such a short period of time that has earned and gained the

respect and the admiration of the American people as a President, who less than sixteen years ago had a popularity rating of 26 per cent in the polls and was looked upon as a man that was a complete failure -- Harry S. Truman.

(Applause) And I think Mr. Truman's greatness was in his courage, in his recognition that it is not important for a man that's President to be popular. It is important for a man that wants to be President or is President to try to be right, to try to do what is right. (Applause) Popularity is a soft and cheap currency. What is important is principle and what is important are the duties and the obligations that you take on when you seek high public office. I thought I would just share with you these thoughts.

I come to you seeking your support, very openly, very openly. I believe that I am prepared to help this country in its problems, in its urban crises. I believe I know of these problems. I have served for four years as the liaison in the federal government with the mayors of the cities of the United States. The mayors know I work with them. I believe that I have some experience now that can be put to higher calling, experience as a local official, as a professor of government, as a United States Senator, as a leader in the Senate, and as a Vice-President. And I

believe, above all, that what I have is faith in this country and faith in its capacity to do what is right.

There are two kinds of politics, ladies and gentlemen. There's the politics of despair, the politics of fear that's practiced and preached by some; and then there's the politics of hope and the politics of progress.

I have taken a good, hard look at both. I do not believe that the way to arouse America is to frighten it. I believe the way to arouse America is to inspire it. I think this nation waits for great calling. I think it wants to do what's right. I'd like to help it.

Thank you very much.

(Standing ovation)

GOVERNOR HUGHES: Thank you very much, Mr. Vice-President, for that candid and frank statement which we certainly expected of you.

I wonder, Mr. Vice-President, if, before the dialogue and the chat that I mentioned, the questions and answers and discussion, if I might take the privilege of introducing the people at the head table here.

Mrs. Betty Wenk on my far left, this very attractive lady that's smoking a cigarette--she has the same vice I have -- is one of the McCarthy pledged delegates

who was elected in one of the congressional districts in Bergen County.

Next to her is an officer of this delegation, Bill Jenkins, who is from Camden, New Jersey.

Next to him is this very attractive lady with the glasses here, Mrs. Betty Kordja, I see here, but we must remember, Bob, never say that unless you say Betty McNamara Kordja. Very important.

Next is our National Committeewoman who has been in politics--I always say this like a joke--for a hundred years, but sometimes ladies don't like that reference. Let me just say for a few years. Thelma Parkinson Sharp, a very great lady. (Applause)

And then our National Committeeman. He's too exhausted to make this introduction himself because he was presiding at a magnificent rally here in Forsgate Farms last night, a repeat of the one that cost you a part of your shirt and cuff links back in 1964, which you were so happy to lose -- David Wilentz. (Applause)

Over here is a friend of mine from Somerset County, a delegate elected also on the McCarthy slate and I think co-chairman with Mrs. Wenk of the McCarthy delegates-- Mr. Dan Gaby. Dan. (Applause)

Here is a very beautiful lady from Hudson County -- most ladies from Hudson County are very beautiful -- Mrs. Alice Dolan. (Applause)

Next, of course, without further ado is Bob Burkhardt. (Applause)

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I tried to shut off that applause because I have heard some rumblings that Bob Burkhardt is interested in being nominated as Vice-President this year. (Laughter)

Now, Mr. Vice-President, I wonder if we might -- would you mind, sir, answering a few questions?

THE VICE-PRESIDENT: Delighted.

GOVERNOR HUGHES: And if you will stand here.

I wish when you speak you will say your name and the general part of the State from which you come because the Vice-President loves every part of our State; I'm sure he'd like to know whether you are from Camden or wherever.

MR. LLOYD NEWBERRY: Mr. Vice-President, my name is Lloyd Newberry. I'm from the Fifth Congressional District; I'm an alternate delegate.

In 1948 I was discharged from the Air Force. I admired your stance at the 1948 convention. I have taught my children to admire Americans who stand for the

things that I believe make great Americans. I think that your record in civil rights is certainly one that's admirable. I have two questions that I want to put to you.

In 1967 the press reported you as saying that Governor Lester Maddux of Georgia was a good Democrat. This man had chased Negroes from the restaurant that he had run and I think that this in part was the reason why he was elected Governor of the State of Georgia.

My questions are these: Since this is to be an open convention and there have been questions involving would you support the Democratic nominee regardless of who he is? could you in your heart support Governor Lester Maddux as a presidential nominee of the Democratic Party?

The other question ---

THE VICE-PRESIDENT: Could I take Number One? My memory span is not too good. Go ahead.

MR. NEWBERRY: The other one is shot. There are Americans in the country who say that the Democratic Party will have to appeal to the South for votes and in that event could you then select or could you approve of Lester Maddux as a running mate if you were to gain the Democratic nomination?

THE VICE-PRESIDENT: I want to assure you

that if you have no worries in life any greater than the ones you have just presented to me, you will live to be a thousand.

(Laughter and applause)

Let me just, because your question is serious and I answered it with a quip, which I don't always think is appropriate. My visit to Georgia on the occasion you referred to was to talk to the National Council of Jewish Women. I had just returned from a trip overseas. I was asked by the Governor to come to his home. I am the Vice-President of the United States. I have had all the governors, including George Wallace, at my home and when I entertained all the governors in Minnesota in 1965 I had Republican governors there, too, lots of them, too many of them. (Laughter) But I was brought up to respect the office and as Vice-President I'm Vice-President of all the people of the United States, whether I like some of them or not.

I went over to see Governor Maddux, who is not my supporter, who calls me socialist, wild man and everything else that I can be called, and he asked me how could he get some help in bringing more aid to his people under the poverty program. That's what he wanted to talk to me about. He said, "We've got to have jobs for our people

here, Mr. Vice-President, and I'm having trouble getting my programs underway."

I said, "If you will come to Washington, Governor, I'll bring you in touch with Mr. Shreiber and others and we will try to help you."

The second thing he said to me: "We'd like very much to get some help in building a Marine Institute under the Marine Sciences Program."

I said, "If you will send your Commissioner of Education, we'll see what we can do."

The third thing I heard that he was going to go over to Alabama and he was invited to a meeting by Mr. Wallace to take a stand of defiance against the United States of America and our desegregation orders and several governors went there to Alabama.

I said, "Governor, let me tell you something. There's only one way to defy the United States and that's to defy it. When you do, you've had it. And let's just quit talking about programs, because if you can't comply with the laws of this land, including the Civil Rights Laws, there aren't going to be any programs. So you better just understand that, Governor. And I suggest to you, as Vice-President, that if I were you I wouldn't join in signing any

statements about defiance because I don't think it's going to help the poverty program in your State or the Marine Science program or anything else. I suggest that you say that you are a Democrat and you are going to stay in the Democratic Party."

We walked out of the house. We are walking down some rock steps. He starts to stumble a bit and I grabbed him by the arm. Now, I suppose if I was a cruel man I should let him fall on his face. (Laughter) But I just wasn't brought up that way. When we got before the press there was a picture taken that showx me holding him by the arm. I'm perfectly willing to hold him by the arm now. If George Wallace is here and starts to fall, I'll hold him by the arm, in fact I wouldn't mind leading him out of the hall. (Laughter and applause)

But I said when I was asked because I was trying to keep this governor from doing something that I thought would not be helpful to his State or helpful to anybody, I didn't say he was a good Democrat. I said he's a Democrat and I said our house has many rooms. There are all kinds of Democrats. I've served with a lot of them in Congress, and some of them have joined up with Republicans and some have left us. The main thing we need to do is have enough

liberal Democrats so that the old coalition that worked for years in that Congress that tried to stop social progress can't stop it. I'm not going to get many of those votes. I know that. I haven't the slightest doubt that I'll be facing a very, very big uphill battle in the South, but I want to leave you with this: Mr. Nixon took a look at the South and he found Strom Thurmond. That's the Old South. There is a New South. There is the New South of new education; the New South, if you please, of new jobs and new industry. There is the New South of Ivan Allen in Atlanta, Terry Sanford and Carl Sanders. There is the New South of the Governor even of Louisiana who sees to it there is voter registration. And when I go to his State to speak, he introduces me before a huge audience of thousands of people and he says, "I want you to meet the creator, the founder and the daddy of civil rights -- the Vice-President of the United States." (Applause) Now, that's the New South.

I want to give you a frank and honest answer, sir. I'm not at all happy about the circumstances that you bring up but I just told you that I won't run on the sainthood ticket. I've made some mistakes. I'm frank to admit them.

MR. REUBEN REDFIELD: I'm Reuben Redfield, 13th District, Elizabeth.

Mr. Vice-President, there is no question in my mind that we have the three best candidates in the Democratic Party. In your talk to us this afternoon you mentioned that if Senator McGovern was the selection of our party you would support him.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT: That's right.

MR. REDFIELD: So that we would have esprit de corps and so that we would not have a split party, you would support Senator McCarthy.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT: My goodness, I've said that about twenty-five times. I've supported Senator McCarthy for the House; I've supported him for the Senate. If he gets the nomination, I'll support him for President. I expect him to do exactly the same thing for me if I get it.
(Applause)

MR. WILLIAM HYLAND (Camden): I think the Democrats can do themselves a great service if we could devise some system of selecting a vice-presidential candidate in a much more democratic and affirmative fashion than the Republicans did. I'm wondering if you have any observation about that, how it can be done so that it does not look to the American people as if somebody is being jammed down the throats of the delegates.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT: Well, since I have on a couple occasions tried to be Vice-President, finally did make it, I really know what you are talking about.

(Laughter) It's a very peculiar system. There is one way that you can do it, just have an open convention, which Adlai Stevenson did in 1956. Just let them nominate. And Estes Kefauver came out of that. John Kennedy came very close. I was a poor third. That's 1956.

It's been the tradition that the nominee of the party at least offered his selection. That doesn't always mean he gets his way, but he makes his selection.

In the instance to which you refer most recently, in the Republican instance, I think that Mr. Nixon thought Mr. Reagan was going to get a large number of Southern votes. He panicked a little bit. He wasn't quite as cool as they tried to make him out, and he made a big arrangement with, as I said, the Old South, the unbelievably Old South -- the period of Strom is the only way I figure to call it.

I would like to be able to go to this convention, if I may be quite candid with you, with enough votes so that I don't have to clear it. The only one I'd have to clear it with would be the convention. I would like very much

to be able to work with responsible leadership across this country in the Party, from the labor movement, from our young people, from different factions in the Party. And that's one thing I intend to do--to consult on who ought to be that nominee.

There isn't any other way that I can do it right now. There could be a time maybe when we have a national primary for Presidents and Vice-Presidents. Maybe that will come if we can ever finance it -- pretty hard. But that may be the out.

Other than that, all I can suggest to you is two ways: The open convention in which anybody can be nominated, and the traditional way in which the nominee for President makes his selection, offers his suggestion and then its still up for vote, as you saw even in the last convention, but seldom is it overruled.

In 1944, you may recall that Franklin Roosevelt said he was for Henry Wallace. The convention, however, decided to have Harry Truman. And in all candor, that was one of the more unusual developments that's taken place in a convention.

I have nothing more to offer to you than that. I wish I could be more helpful. I'm happy to tell you we've

got some mighty good people in our Party who can surely serve. And I want a Vice-President that's on my ideological wavelength. I want somebody that I can work with. (Applause) I want somebody that knows about this country, knows about the urgent necessity, needs of this country. And I think I have some pretty good ideas who some of those somebodies are. (Applause)

MR. HERBERT KLINE (Passaic County): Mr. Vice-President, I heard you say that you are the granddaddy or daddy of civil rights and I certainly agree with that and for that you have my undying admiration.

I see today twenty years later a problem that is somewhat parallel to civil rights and that is to give to those people to whom we have given civil rights the opportunity to enjoy all the fruits of our democracy. There are some who have said that our participation in the war in South Vietnam has so hampered us economically that we cannot do that as we would like to do. I wonder if you could give us your comments on that subject.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT: First of all I think it's fair to say that the costs of the involvement in the war in Vietnam have taken a substantial, a good deal of our resources. It runs about 28 to 30, let's say in round numbers

\$30 billion this past year. It hasn't been that way each year. This has been the high year. And that \$30 billion people think would have been expended, had it not been spent in Vietnam, on our cities. I wish I really believed that were the case. I think we would have had more, however. I do think the war in Vietnam has drained resources from what you and I would like to see in our urban areas, our rural poverty areas, our education, and so forth. I think that's true.

Now let me give you the other side of the coin. We are spending today 300 per cent more in federal aid to education than we were four years ago. Our total federal aid to education with research programs from the different agencies of government, higher education, student loans, the kind of G.I. benefits to education, elementary and secondary, vocational education, Head Start, runs thirteen billion, two hundred million dollars. Four years ago it ran four billion. We are spending today four times as much in health, of course Medicare is involved in this, as we did four and five years ago. We have an increase in our social budget, and this is what the conservatives in Congress are raising cane about, we have an increase in our social budget in the last four years of forty billion dollars.

That's why they said cut six billion out.

Now, I was in Congress after Korea and we had more poverty after Korea than we've got now. We had more illiteracy than we have now. We had desperate needs in education. We had no Medicare. We had no aid to the mentally retarded, no aid to the mentally handicapped or the mentally ill. And after Korea there wasn't a single dollar of the money that we saved from the peace in Korea that went into any of these programs. I'll tell you what Congress did. It cut the taxes. We didn't have any federal aid to education. We didn't have any federal aid to the municipalities. The amount of money that went to states and localities was reduced.

So whatever may be the fact and the fact is, as I stated earlier, I'm sure that the war has taken some of the resources that you and I would have fought for, argued for and hopefully got for our domestic needs. I'm not always sure that the Congress would have given them, but at least we could have made a good fight for them.

And I think we ought to face up to this, that this is an expensive business that we are involved in. That's why I'm for bringing it to an end as quickly as it's humanly possible to do so. (Applause)

I want to just leave this word with you. Many people have been so critical of our Administration that we have almost convinced ourselves that it's all bad. Don't misunderstand me. I know the honest differences that people have and I respect those differences. I'm not happy about everything, either. But let me make it quite clear. I don't think this Party can go to the public and say we've done nothing and all we have done is make mistakes. We have nine million people that have come out of poverty in the last four years, of which three million are black. We have three million people that came out of poverty this last year, of which one million are black. We have one million, seven hundred thousand people in training for jobs now and five years ago we didn't have one.

We have done some things. We have passed more consumer legislation (applause) -- we have passed more consumer legislation than ever before. We have water pollution control, air pollution control, clean rivers.

I heard a discussion one time. Somebody said we are not spending as much on pollution control as we should. And then somebody else said no, I think we are even reducing some of it this year. I wanted to almost get in the fight and say well, two years ago you didn't have any.

You see, it isn't that we have come to the millenium. You know what's happened -- we have rising expectations in this country. We have just passed the greatest housing bill that's ever been passed by any Congress. We passed a tremendous housing proposal here recently, and the President fought for it. We passed open occupancy.

You know, I didn't want to have my record based on twenty years ago. When the Senate of the United States was in filibuster on the open housing bill, a civil rights bill which I encouraged the Cabinet and the President to send to Congress and which I was responsible for helping get through the Congress, I remember that three times the filibuster stopped us. I was called back from a much needed week-end rest and they said: There are three Senators, Mr. Vice-President, that you have to talk to and you've got to get to break that filibuster. My Senator, Walter Mondale, was the author of that bill. I got the Chairman of the committee, Senator Sparkman, to even permit him to hold hearings. And I got the three Senators that broke the filibuster. And there isn't one person in this audience that really expected that we were going to be able to pass in the Congress of the United States this year an open housing bill. But we did. And that's a major civil rights

issue, a tremendous civil rights issue. (Applause)

MR. RICHARD SAMUELS: There were two things you said in your speech. One was that it's very important that we all agree to beat former Vice-President Nixon.

The other thing was that the popularity of a President isn't all that important.

Do you think the popularity of a presidential candidate this year in the Democratic Party is important in light of the candidacy of Vice-President Nixon?

THE VICE-PRESIDENT: I think it's very helpful and I'm happy to tell you that if you take a look at all the popularity polls that have been held since April up to now and balance them off, that I do pretty well.

(Applause)

MR. JACOB TRAPP: Mr. Vice-President, I have been a Democrat probably longer than you have.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT: Yes, sir.

MR. TRAPP: Merely because I'm a bit older, I have never run for office until I ran for delegate. I have been a Democrat and believed in party responsibility. I did serve under Governor Blood of Utah on the first State Welfare Board the State of Utah ever had, for several years. And I have been sometimes an enthusiastic Democrat and some-

times with reservations, but always a Democrat. I couldn't go to the other side -- ever.

This fall I ran for delegate to the Democratic convention, committed to McCarthy. And my reason, of course, was the war in Vietnam, which I think you have consistently under-estimated so far as the feelings of several million Americans is concerned. Nothing in my entire life has cut as deeply as this, not because I thought it was militarily disastrous, which it was, or economically disastrous, which it was, but because I felt it was morally wrong, just as Abraham Lincoln felt about the Mexican war. I preached a sermon on that in my church on Lincoln's Birthday and it was a very telling sermon. I didn't mention Vietnam once. And I think it has cut as deeply with as many Americans, including my son-in-law who is one of the most famous scientists in the world. He was a scientific adviser to our government until he resigned in disgust because they paid him money to come to Washington to give him a brain-washing rather than ask his advice.

But this has cut very deeply with several million Americans, very deeply. It means a lot to us -- what it did to Vietnam and what it did to our own people. And I would like the Democratic Party to nominate some one

who will lead us in a new direction here. I don't think Nixon will. I think his acceptance speech was demagogic. I think he is a cold war baby who never grew up. He is making sort of adult sounds now but they are only throat deep. And since you are a very likely nominee, I'm very serious about this, I don't think you can win unless you can convince the country that you are going to lead us in a new direction on this. And how are you going to do it? I think this is a very serious question with a lot of delegates. We'd like to win. We don't want -- the last thing we want is Nixon in the White House. And we don't think we can win on the Johnson record in Vietnam. We just don't think we can.

I hurried home from Europe to vote for Johnson four years ago because over against Goldwater he said he wouldn't commit us to a great land war in Asia, and he did. He made himself a prisoner of war so far as domestic things were concerned, where he could have been the greatest President we ever had. And it's a tragedy. It's a tragedy. I'm not saying he was a rascal. I'm not saying anything.

A DELEGATE: Mr. Vice-President, there are a lot of people would like to ask questions. What is the question?

MR. TRAPP: I think this is the most serious question. How are you going to convince the American people that we are going in a new direction?

THE VICE-PRESIDENT: I'm very grateful to you for the sincere and moving and rational manner in which you stated your convictions and posed your question. There is no doubt in my mind that this is the issue that divides many of us and bothers very deeply, in fact touches very deeply the hearts and the spirits and the minds of many, many thousands, yea, millions of Americans. I don't have any doubt about that at all. It's a very unpopular matter. And it's something that troubles me, too.

I can only say this to you, that all of my life I have tried to direct my energies and what limited talents I have towards a constructive purpose. I have felt for a long time that there was great danger, for example, in the arms race which I mentioned to you. I think that Vietnam has beclouded that danger. It has in a sense put it away. The people have been so focused on Vietnam that they fail to see that there are great dangers in the Middle East where our national well-being may be tested more than even in Southeast Asia. I'm afraid that some of us haven't taken adequate note of the tremendous investments which are

about to be made here in our own country unless we put a halt to it, and surely in the Soviet Union in a spiraling arms race and new weapons, sophisticated weapons systems. I want to do something about that.

I recognize, my friend, that the world has changed greatly, that this is no longer a world in which the American word is the command. The Communist world has changed. It's no longer a monolith. Take a look at Czechoslovakia, Roumania, Yugoslavia and Hungary. And it's going to change even more. I think that the purpose of NATO has changed a great deal. It's not only a defensive alliance; it has become a political instrument for peaceful engagement, as we put it, towards eastern Europe. I think all of this tells us one thing, that I recognize there have to be new priorities. I think, for example, American aid as such can no longer be as much as it was bilateral, it has to become multilateral, regional in these world institutions, the Asian Bank, the African Bank, the Inter-American Bank, World Bank, and so forth. I think we are going to have to learn that there is no *pax Americana*. We are not the world's policemen. We do have interests and we are going to have to very selectively reassess where the interest areas are that really vitally affect our national interest, not what

would we do to gain peace.

I have supported every bombing pause that this country has had, and not only supported it, my dear friend, argued for them. I have even as of recent days been trying to ascertain as best I could just what is happening in the Vietnamese picture on the military front. Is the present lull in fighting, and there is a lull, a political signal from Hanoi that we ought to take another initiative of stopping all the bombing of the north? Or is it, as some of our people say, a lull before a tremendous big offensive?

I have looked at the intelligence reports. I see them every day. I see the best this government can produce and I really do not believe these men are all prejudiced. I honestly do not. There is no one mind in this government. I have heard men in this government argue around the cabinet table as vigorously as anybody has ever argued in this room, but ultimately the President has to make a decision.

I really believe that the conference that is underway in Paris has within it the same momentum towards the process of peace that the war that's on in Vietnam has had the same momentum for escalation. Or let me put it an-

other way. Wars, once they start, have a built-in escalation to them. The peace process, once it starts--and the first time it started, by the way, was in May. We didn't have any peace process going before that. Now we have something going. It's difficult, it's slow, it's filled with harrassment and it doesn't seem to be making much progress; but the fact is that we are in serious discussions. That is the fact.

Mr. Nixon was briefed in Texas by the top officials of this government, and the day after I was briefed by the same people, including the President of the United States. I flew there to sit down with Mr. Vance, who came back from Paris, our top officers of our government for intelligence agencies, and I looked over a ream of material that would go from one end of this room to the other. I read it every morning. It's delivered at my house at seven o'clock, under guard, every morning. There are only two reports that people get--the President and the Vice-President--the most sensitive, selective reports of intelligence information that this government and its allies can produce. And we spend a lot to get it and it isn't designed to fool us. It's designed to inform us. And a man's judgment is only as good as his information.

When Mr. Nixon came away from his briefing,

in the headlines were: Nixon says bombing must continue. When I came away from an identical briefing I said that we are now at a point in the conferences in Paris where serious discussions are taking place, and they are, where any loose talk one way or another could jeopardize those discussions, where any talk of concessions one way or another might jeopardize those discussions. I did say that I thought the word reciprocity, which had been called for by the Secretary of State as a way of saying that we'll stop the bombing if you reciprocate, that it was too harsh, too firm; that reciprocity indicates to most people fifty-fifty -- you walk a mile, I walk a mile. You come see me, I come see you. And I used the words knowingly, not just my thoughts, but knowingly after prolonged discussions with top people in this government, including the President, and it is my view that we should stop all the bombing of North Vietnam if there is any indication of restraint or any reasonable response.

Now, what does this give us? It gives our arbitrators, our negotiators the flexibility that they need to interpret what today we are not quite sure of what we see. And this is why I believe that if we just persevere here, don't escalate, don't lose our cool, and we've got a lot of people today that are telling the government and the

President in particular: Mr. President, you are jeopardizing the lives of five hundred thousand men; you ought to be bombing more; you ought to be going at them. And some of us are saying: Mr. President, we are in the process of peace. This isn't what it was back in February and April. There is a new dimension that's taking place in Vietnam and it's in Paris. And whatever we do on the battlefield affects what happens in Paris. Whatever restraint we exercise and North Vietnam exercises has an impact in Paris. And I want to exercise the restraint and I look for any movement on the part of the enemy that indicates any restraint on their part.

And I must say finally to you that I don't know of any man that more qualifies as a peace man than the head of our delegation in Paris - Averill Harriman. If there's a man that's a dove, that's the man. (Applause)

So this is the best I can tell you except finally tell you if there is no peace in Vietnam by January 20th, and I can't make a safe prediction, I have a heart full of hope, I can give you my word, because I know of your sincerity and your deep commitment, that I will do everything within my power to walk even the extra mile, even if it indicates some humiliation and political attack on me,

to find some way, some honorable way to find a political settlement which does not require surrender by the enemy nor does it require that we retreat in a spirit of fear and intimidation and leave people to the mercy of others -- try to find some way to get a political settlement. And I think we can find it. I really believe we can find it.

(Applause)

GOVERNOR HUGHES: Ladies and gentlemen, the Vice-President couldn't be more generous and I know that he wants to reserve some of the valuable few minutes which he has, which amount to about seventeen, as we figure it now, in order to have an opportunity to shake hands and to greet each one of you.

We might have a little receiving line, Bob, down here. Would you take charge of that, please? And as people come along introduce them. Can we do that, Mr. Vice-President? Thank you for your generosity.

(Applause)

(Concluded at 5:50 p.m.)



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