REMARKS OF

HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

DEMOCRATIC NOMINEE

TO BE

PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Collège Panel

Tuesday, September 17, 1968

Rochester, New York

WARD & PAUL

OFFICIAL REPORTERS 25 K STREET, N. E. Washington, D. C. 20002

(202) 628-4266

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

Next to him is Martha Riley, Vice President of the Young Republicans Club of Nazareth College. She comes to this city from Oswego.

Then Don Williamson, who is a Sophomore at the University of Rochester, transferred here this year from Wichita State. He is a journalism major and he is a resident of the city.

Last but not least, Jim Evans, a Senior at the Rochester Institute of Technology, President of the Student Association there. He comes from Endicott, New York.

Mr. Vice President, these young people represent a generation of Americans who will have very great responsibility for the next ten years. In fact, they have very great responsibilities now. As the potential leaders of tomorrow, they are very concerned about their inheritance, about the America in which they are going to live and hope to work, to which they will make a contribution. I can assure you that they have had an opportunity during the past few days to discuss many issues with their fellow students, and I think that their hopes and fears and concerns reflect the ideas of certainly the academic community of Rochester.

We are very much concerned about law and order, about civil rights, about urban renewal, about poverty and, of course, about education. But above all, they are greatly concerned about human aspirations, the desires of the heart, of all human dignity. In a word, they are greatly concerned with humanity.

My fellow panelists, it is a great honor to present to you the Vice President of the United States, Mr. Hubert Humphrey, and I would ask that he begin his discussion with a few remarks.

Vice President Humphrey.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Father Lavery, members of the panel, ladies and gentlemen. My first observation is that I have done television shows in many places, but this is the first time I have been on camera in a hanger at an airport. I know that the conditions here are not exactly conducive to this kind of reflective exercise, but we will do our best.

I welcome the opportunity to receive the questions from our distinguished, intelligent, active leaders of the colleges and universities in this area. I have been trying in my campaign to conduct what I call the politics of participation. By that I mean to have people in audiences, student leaders, business, labor, and farmer, housewife, young and old, participate in the discussion of the problems of our times.

It is sometimes the view of some of our people that

5

9

those of us in public life generally speak from prepared scripts, generally written, some people think, by others. I have never quite indulged in that. Maybe it would be better if I would. I would possibly make fewer mistakes.

But I thought that in this instance, in this campaign, because there is such a desire for dialogue and there is such a desire on the part particularly of young people for what I call participatory politics, that we would make that possible. So without further adieu, in order to be st utilize the time that we have, Father Lavery, I would like to take the questions of our panelists, and I do so in great respect for their qualities and their ability, hopeful that my answers might be worthy of their questions.

> I will take the first question. FATHER LAVERY: Thank you, Mr. Vice President. I will ask Don Williamson if he would ask the first

question.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Mr. Vice President, owing to the fact that you are a member of the present administration, I realize that some degree of loyalty is necessary. But by the very fact that you and not President Johnson are running for President in November, what can you tell us will be your basic difference from the administration which, at best, the American public is unhappy with?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, Mr. Williamson, I have never felt that it was necessary for me to dwell on the differences as a Democratic nominee with a Democratic administration. I hope that you will forgive me, but I did not think that was the way we could best conduct this election. I have thought that it would be better if I could state my own views and outline what I thought was necessary for this Nation.

I have said from every platform that my desire in the international scene is to find the way to achieve peace in Vietnam and to find a way to slow down the arms race in this world. I think I have some credentials in this field, credentials as a result of some years of public life in which I have been the main mover in sponsor of such programs as the Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty, the Peace Corps, the Disarmament Agency, having served as a delegate to the United Nations, having served twice as an adviser to our delegation on the Disarmament Committee in Geneva.

So I state in my own right as a candidate that one of my objectives will be, first of all, the adoption of the Nonproliferation Treaty. It is before the Congress now, the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. I helped negotiate that treaty. As a Senator, I was one of those that long promoted such efforts. I believe this treaty is in our national interest, in the interest of peace.

I will also seek the opportunity to meet with the leaders of the great powers, nations that have invested heavily in arms, to slow down the arms race, to reach an agreement on arms control and disarmament, or some form of halting the arms race in the Middle East, to accelerate the development of the peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations, to place a great deal of emphasis upon the U.N. as a vehicle for our foreign policy, to encourage regional development amongst nations in Africa, Asia, and Latin America as a way to expand our peace efforts, and in Vietnam, to seek hopefully, at least, when there is no danger to the safety of South Vietnam or to our own troops, a reduction of American forces in that area.

And as the platform of my party states, and I support that platform, a cessation of the bombing when that cessation will not jeopardize the safety of our own forces and when there is at least some indication of response from Hanoi. I think that is a fair proposition.

I believe that on the domestic front, I have outlined a series of programs: the Marshall Plan for our cities; a national domestic concept for our domestic programs; a program of a national forum for youth, putting an office in the White House for the affairs of young people, youth affairs, to keep in contact with our college and younger people so that they have some way to participate; programs of expanded care for the health of our youngsters -- not just Medicare for the elderly, but programs that help care for the young; some very substantial improvements in our urban programs.

So I stand on my own right. I will outline these programs.

Now, I believe we can say that what we have done in the past years -- not just the last four or five -- has been good. I don't think it is enough. I think the beginning we have made indicates that there is more to be done. Part of the ferment of today in America is due to the fact that some people see hope and they want more progress. I am dedicated to that.

FATHER LAVERY: Greg, will you please place another question?

MR. EVANS: Yes, thank you, Father.

Mr. Vice President, I believe it was stated in last week's Time Magazine that your people feel that Governor Wallace will help you by taking votes from Mr. Nixon. First, why do you feel that it is going to hurt him and not you?

Secondly, it is the feeling of our constituents of the four area colleges of Rochester that the majority of them are leaning toward Mr. Nixon. Most of them were McCarthy supporters. Why do you feel this is happening, and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

what are you going to do to get the college people on your VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Let't take the first part of your question. The first part was that Mr. Wallace was going to take more votes from Mr. Nixon according to what? Would you mind giving me the first part again? MR. EVANS: That the candidacy of Governor Wallace for President would help you by taking more votes from Mr. Nixon. VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Who said that? MR. EVANS: I believe it was Time Magazine. VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Time Magazine doesn't run my campaign. I have a respect for that fine weekly, but it is made of mainly views and opinions based on observations. It is my view that Mr. Wallace is making inroads in both Mr. Nixon's followers and mine. It is my view that Mr. Wallace is not good for this country. It is my view that Mr. Wallace's candidacy represents nothing but reversion to the past, separatism in this country, at a time when we need a pulling of our people together, when we need integration, when we need a total abolition of segregation. I can only say one thing of Mr. Wallace's candidacy. I think it is bad news for the United States.

Now, on the second matter, as to some of the young people on the campuses, as you have indicated, who might support Mr. Nixon, particularly some of the McCarthy supporters -- that, of course, is their right. I can't imagine how they feel that would be helpful to their cause. Most of the McCarthy supporters had strong views about the war in Vietnam. I have never known Mr. Nixon to be a dove, if we can use the parlance of the day. And I would hope that those who classify themselves as liberals in politics are not oneissue people.

I would hope that those who feel that they have the sense of compassion for humanity would take a look at the record of myself and Mr. Nixon and make a comparison. I cannot believe that the goals, the lofty ideals of the young peoble who supported Mr. McCarthy are going to be realized by the election of Mr. Nixon.

I can understand how they may be angry. We have all been angry at some time in our lives. I can understand how they might be disappointed. But I think it is imperative that all of us understand that our alternatives are not always between perfection and total imperfection. The alternatives are between human beings and individuals, between platforms and men and issues on the basis of the record.

Therefore, I will direct my attention to young people, supporters of Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGovern, and myself, on the basis of trying to build a society here in America

that is worthy of young people, recognizing that -- well, for example, that the nonproliferation treaty is in the interest of young people. You are going to live longer than I am. If the spread of nuclear weapons continues, your life is that much more uncertain.

Mr. Nixon says we ought to hold up on that treaty. I say we ought to sign it. I think it is in the interest of humanity. I think we either halt the arms race or we are going to halt humanity.

I think the war in Vietnam is ugly, difficult, painful, and costly. The war in Vietnam is not nearly as dangerous to all of humanity as the spiraling nuclear arms race between separate powers. I think it is essential that young men and women stop reacting with their emotions and start thinking with their intelligence -- namely, what is the greater danger?

The greater danger is the spread of these powerful weapons of destruction in the hands of people who are totally unreliable and emotional, that could obliterate all of mankind.

I might add that Mr. Nixon does not seem to like our war on poverty. Mr. Nixon doesn't seem to agree with our federal aid to education program. Mr. Nixon didn't support Medicare. Mr. Nixon hadn't had much interest in some of the things we have been doing, for example, in consumer legislation. I think young people are interested in that.

He didn't support aid to higher education. There are thousands of young men and women in college today because a President cared, because a government cared, because a party cared. I can't for the life of me believe that young people will become so impassioned on what, on whether Mr. Nixon is more of a hawk than I, than anybody in this administration, as to cast their vote for Mr. Nixon, who is the man who wanted to go to Vietnam in 1954 and had to be literally chastised by his own President; the man who wanted to send armed forces to Southeast Asia in 1954.

If that is the kind of thinking of people who say they are liberals, progressives, lovers of peace, then I must say we are living in a very confused world. I can't believe it.

Frankly, I can't find much of it. I find a few people who are still perfectly willing to hang on and to feel that they were denied, and they have many reasons to feel like that. I find a few like that.

But I find, for example, that when I was in the State of Michigan, the head of the McCarthy group supporting me, introduced me to an audience. I find Steven Mitchell, the Chairman of Senator McCarthy's effort, one of my vice

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

chairmen of my citizens committees -- I find them all over the United States. I consider that many people are not so much for McCarthy that are acting the way you are talking about as they are for themselves. I might say if people are going to picket for peace, why don't they give us all a little of it, instead of keeping it all on one candidate? Next? FATHER LAVERY: Martha Riley? MISS RILEY: Mr. Vice President, I would like to know just how you intend to pay for all these programs that you are supporting. You want to imrease all this aid and welfare, and I would like to know just how you intend to pay for this. Are the taxes going to be raised? Just what are you going to do? It seems to me the present administration hasn't been able to balance the budget at all, and you have been part of this administration. VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Yes. MISS RILEY: I would like to see us balance the budget for a change, and just know where the money is going, to whom, and know that the middle class people aren't paying for everything. VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Yes.

First of all, may I say that the only tax reductions you have had in the last ten or twelve years have come from Democratic administrations. That is the first fact. We have had three tax reductions since 1964. We had one tax reduction from 1953 to 1960, 1961. That was built into the law. There wasn't anything they could do about it. It automatically came off by date.

I remember the tax bill. I was in the Congress at the time. I remember those eight years of Republicanism -three recessions, mass unemployment, up to 7 per cent of the work force.

I also remember that there were all the poor that there are now and more, all the illiterates that there are now and more, all the problems in the cities that we have now and more. And I remember that nothing was done about them.

I know that these sores were left to fester in American life. They were ignored: three recessions, \$175 billion of lost income from lost employment. That was the price of eight years of not facing up to the facts. Only one tax reduction, compelled by law.

This administration has given us three tax reductions, not compelled by law, but three tax reductions on the initiative of the President and the Congress. And one little modest tax increase called the surtax, which is (3)

24

25

1 22 23

a very small tax indeed in terms of a tax reduction. The tax reduction still remains approximately \$15 billion.

Had we maintained the same tax rates that the Republicans left us with, we would have had a balanced budget, but we did not. We relied upon this economy. We put the money back into private hands.

Republicans talk about private enterprise, but we put the money back into private enterprise. We said it is better for the private enterprise sector to get this money back for tax reductions, for investments, to keep this economy going, than it is for the government to have it.

We have had ninety months of consecutive prosperity, ninety consecutive months without a recession. We have had approximately \$80 or \$90 billion of gross national product. The index of inflation under this administration is, on the wholesale price index, .1 per cent higher than it was in eight years of Republicanism, 9.2 as compared to 9.3. Despite Vietnam, despite the fact of all the programs we have had.

I submit that these programs have done a great deal for our country. The wealth of this country is in its people. Family income has increased 32 per cent under the Democrats. It increased 9 per cent in eight years under Republicans. It went up, unemployment went up two million under the Republicans, went down two million under the Democrats. Ten million people have come out of poverty in this last administration, ten million of them.

Corporate profits remained rather static under the Republicans. Isn't that interesting? Businessmen had corporate profits remaining rather static. They have doubled under this administration.

Wages have gone up.

I must say if we are going to debate the Republican and Democratic politics on the basis of the economy, we have a mighty good case.

How are we going to pay for these programs, by an expanding economy. We increase by \$25 million our revenue each year without increasing our taxes. How? By increasing the productivity of the American people, so that if new money is needed to train the unemployed, to start getting at the problems of the ghetto, to start helping more students into college, into elementary and secondary education, that new money comes out of the growth of this economy. It is what we call social dividends. There isn't any new money when you have recessions.

Speaking of middle-income people, they are the ones that suffer from recessions. They are the ones that are frequently laid off from jobs. They can't pay their mortgage payments, can't take care of their debts.

This Democratic administration has been a boon for

25

middle-income group is substantially higher than it is in 2 FATHER LAVERY: Paula Smolski? 3 4 and order --5 MISS SMOLSKI: 6 7 8 have had their hands full. 9 to speak of my ideas on law and order. 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 equipment. 19 I think law and order are not cheap. cheap. 20 21 22 undertrained. 23 24

any other group. So I think we have a pretty good case. MISS SMOLSKI: Mr. Vice President, how is your idea of law and order similar to that of Mayor Daley's? VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: How does my idea of law

the middle-income people, because the increase in the

Compare with Mayor Daley's? VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Every mayor has his problems. I have been watching Mayor Lindsay of New York with the disturbances that were at Columbia University, and I watched, at least for a few moments, what happened in Chicago. I must say that both mayors have their hands full,

I was a mayor of a large city myself. I have some appreciation of the problems that they face. I would like

First of all, law and order costs money. Mr. Nixon has talked about law and order, but he hasn't said how he is going to pay for it. I have said you have to have extra funds, you have to pay your policemen more. The average policeman gets two-thirds of a living wage. Yet he has to keep peace in your community and you want him to be honest.

You have to professionalize your police force. You ask a social worker who works in a city to have a college education. You ask a librarian to have a college education. You ask a public health officer or visiting nurse to have a college education. You don't ask that of a police officer. Your recruiting standards are much lower.

If you want better police, more disciplined police, police that do not engage in police brutality, you have to pick them better. You have to have higher standards, you have to train them better, you have to give them better

As John Kennedy said, peace and freedom are not

I think this country owes a debt to its police. They are the most disciplined group in this land. Without them, we wouldn't have much going for us today, and they have suffered a great deal. I am one of their defenders, because to me, they have been underpaid, underdeveloped,

What else is there in law and order? By the way, it is going to cost more money -- state help, local government, federal government. Most of the cities can't support that. They don't have the tax base for that, so the federal government is going to have to come in with some grants in aid. It won't take too much, but a little extra

will help. Training is needed.

But there is something else in law and order -justice. I do not say -- Mr. Nixon says that he wanted to
double the rate of convictions. He said Mr. Humphrey wants
to double the poverty program. Mr. Humphrey believes there
ought to be convictions of people who are guilty. Mr.
Nixon has never had to enforce a law. I have. I have been
mayor of a city. I have had to run a police department, be
responsible for it. I trained it, modernized it, paid it,
saw to it that it had something worthwhile.

But there is something else besides doubling convictions. I gather if you double convictions, Mr. Nixon is saying he prefers to build penitentiaries, jails. But I will tell you something that you need more than jails: you need better schools, better hospitals, you need better housing. To every penitentiary that Mr. Nixon wants to build, and I gather that he does, I prefer to build a better neighborhood for you to live in.

(Applause.)

FATHER LAVERY: Mr. Vice President, the last question will come from James Valone.

MR. VALONE: Thank you, Father.

Mr. Vice President, I am one young person among many young people who will, for the first time, vote in the presidential election. Frankly, I am worried. The late President Kennedy inspired the best in us, to go out and do something for our Nation and for the world. Mr. Nixon and Mr. Wallace are playing upon fears in the American public, and they offer us nothing. We are still waiting to hear from you the challenge which you have to offer us.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I want to offer you a challenge. I tried to today, up in a university in Buffalo. All my life, I have worked with young people, as a teacher, a student, a professor, in politics. I think they are the reason for living. They give us something that makes you feel good to be with them.

I see many troubled young people today, and I can understand why. They know our country is rich, they know that is not enough. They know we have fabulous machines, but they are asking the question, is the man for the machine or is the machine for the man.

They have been born in war, called in war. They have had a tremendous period of affluence, which many of us of an older generation never enjoyed. But affluence and wealth are not enough, because man does not live by bread alone. We have learned that. He isn't satisfied.

What do I have to offer you? Challenge. You are needed. You are not needed carrying signs; you are needed in a mental health institution. You are needed in a mental

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

11 retardation center. You are needed in tutorial work in the ghettos. You are needed on the playground. We couldn't get supervisors this summer for our playgrounds. We opened up thousands of playgrounds this summer, looking for young people to help us. You are needed in boys camps, you are needed in homes for the elderly, you are needed in government, you are needed in politics. You are just needed.

My challenge to you is not that it is easy, but that it is difficult. You are going to be needed in the social services. We need hundreds of volunteers these days, hundreds of thousands of them for many of the greatinstitutions of municipal and state and federal governments, for voluntary agencies.

I know camps for crippled children can't get enough help. I know hospitals today that are without adequate people, without adequate personnel. Now, that is social service.

The new politics is the politics of service, not the politics of demonstrations; the politics of service. The new politics for young people is the politics of participation -- not participation on the street, but participation in things that count. That is what I offer to you.

Whatnelse do I offer to you? I ask you to help me cleanse this country of its bigotry, of the practices of discrimination, of racism which grips this country in many areas. I ask you to speak up.

The first place to practice the art of peace is at If we can't practice the art of peace amongst our own people at home, what makes you think we can bring peace to the world?

The first place to practice the war on poverty is at home. What makes you think we can save the people of India and Pakistan when we can't save our own people that speak a common language?

The first place to be concerned about education is at home. That is what we are talking about to the young people of today. I ask you to rise to new heights of social service in this country, to think in terms of how a -- how you better can be utilized.

I say to every university, to every university faculty, every student, make yourself a part of the action in your community. I know it is better to talk about what you can do about Vietnam, but you are not there. Most of the students in universities are not going to get there under the present draft laws.

May I say that today, the place to get into the action is where you live. You build a better world starting in your own home, starting in your own college; you build a

better world starting in your own home, starting in your own college; you build a better world starting in your own community. You build a better America starting in your own city, and so on up the line.

I believe this is a great opportunity, and I intend to call young people to action to see that it gets done -- in the Peace Corps, in the voluntary service, in the teachers corps. We need hundreds of young people in the teachers corps. We need you in VISTA. We need you in the war on poverty.

I know these are not very dramatic things, but that is where you are needed. That is where the energy ought to go.

I call upon the fraternities of the colleges to pledge hundreds of manhours to the needs of their towns, to the needs of the disenfranchised, and of the needy and deprived.

That is my program for you. I hope you can help me. FATHER LAVERY: Mr. Vice President, speaking for the panel and all the students who represent this area, I would like to thank you most sincerely for being with us, for helping these young people search for answers to very important questions.

Thank you very much.



Minnesota Historical Society

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

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

