

OPENING STATEMENT

PRESS CONFERENCE

October 14, 1968

I HAVE SOME BRIEF ANNOUNCEMENTS.

LET ME BEGIN TODAY BY BRINGING YOU UP-TO-DATE
ON THE SITUATION CONCERNING POSSIBLE DEBATES AMONG
THE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES.

AS YOU KNOW, I SENT TELEGRAMS YESTERDAY TO
MR. NIXON AND MR. WALLACE INFORMING THEM THAT I
HAVE RESERVED AN HOUR OF TELEVISION TIME -- BETWEEN
10 AND 11 P.M. NEXT SUNDAY NIGHT ON CBS -- FOR DEBATES
AMONG THE CANDIDATES.

L I SUGGESTED TO THEM IN MY TELEGRAMS THAT THEY
SHARE WITH ME THE COST OF THE TELEVISION TIME. BUT I

ALSO MADE CLEAR THAT, IF THEY WOULD NOT SHARE THE

the Citizens Committee
COST, I WOULD PAY THE ENTIRE COST MYSELF.

THUS FAR I HAVE RECEIVED NO REPLY TO THOSE
TELEGRAMS. BECAUSE OF THE NECESSITY FOR MAKING
FINAL DECISIONS ON PROGRAMMING, I ASKED FOR REPLY
NO LATER THAN 5:00 P.M. TOMORROW. ^{Thursday} TOMORROW NIGHT
OR WEDNESDAY MORNING -- AFTER RECEIVING THEIR
RESPONSES -- I SHALL HAVE A FURTHER ANNOUNCEMENT
TO MAKE CONCERNING NEXT SUNDAY NIGHT'S PROGRAM.

◀ MAY I SAY, IN THE MEANTIME, THAT I WAS DELIGHTED
TO SEE AND HEAR GOVERNOR AGNEW'S STATEMENT
YESTERDAY ON "FACE THE NATION" THAT HE WOULD BE
WILLING TO DEBATE SENATOR MUSKIE IF GENERAL LEMAY
DID NOT PARTICIPATE. I HAVE A FEELING WE MAY BE
MAKING SOME PROGRESS, TUNE IN AGAIN TOMORROW.

I WISH TO THANK, IN THE MEANTIME, CONGRESSMAN
JIM O'HARA AND HIS COLLEAGUES FOR THEIR VALIANT HELP
IN TRYING TO KEEP THE DEBATE BILL ALIVE IN THE
CONGRESS.

I REGRET THE OBSTRUCTIVE TACTICS BY SENATE
REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP, WHICH KILLED THIS BILL.

* * *

SECOND, I WANT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE TO GIVE
THEIR FULL ATTENTION TO THE PLATFORM OF THE
WALLACE-LE MAY PARTY PUBLISHED IN THIS MORNING'S
NEWSPAPERS.

WHEN ANY AMERICAN THINKS FOR A MOMENT ABOUT
GIVING HIS VOTE TO THE WALLACE-LE MAY TICKET --
RATHER THAN THE NIXON-AGNEW OR HUMPHREY-MUSKIE
TICKET -- HE SHOULD KNOW JUST WHAT THE CONSEQUENCES
OF THAT ACT WOULD BE.

FIRST OF ALL, HE WOULD RISK THROWING THE
PRESIDENCY -- AND THE POLICIES OF THE NEXT PRESIDENT --
INTO A POSITION OF JEOPARDY. MR. WALLACE HAS SAID
TIME AND AGAIN THAT, IF HE GETS ENOUGH ELECTORAL
VOTES TO KEEP MR. NIXON OR ^{me} FROM HAVING A MAJORITY,
HE WILL NOT ALLOW THE DECISIONS TO GO TO THE HOUSE
OF REPRESENTATIVES, BUT WILL USE HIS ELECTORAL
STRENGTH TO BARGAIN IN THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE.

I, FOR ONE, WOULD NOT MAKE ANY SUCH DEAL WITH
MR. WALLACE. THERE WILL NOT BE ANY HUMPHREY-MUSKIE
DEAL WITH WALLACE, LEMAY OR THURMOND.

THEN, EVERY AMERICAN SHOULD KNOW JUST WHAT MR.
WALLACE AND GENERAL LEMAY STAND FOR -- ASIDE FROM
THEIR TOUGH-TALK STATEMENTS ON RACE AND ON MILITARY
SOLUTIONS TO OUR PROBLEMS AROUND THE WORLD.

THEIR PARTY PLATFORM DOES NOT HAVE A
CIVIL RIGHTS PLANK.

L IT WOULD REQUIRE ELECTION OF FEDERAL DISTRICT
JUDGES AND WOULD REQUIRE SUPREME COURT JUDGES
TO BE RECONFIRMED AFTER UNSTATED PERIODS -- THUS
DESTROYING OUR INDEPENDENT JUDICIARY AND UPSETTING
OUR WHOLE ^{*Constitutional*} SYSTEM OF CHECKS AND BALANCES.

L IT CALLS FOR WHAT WOULD SURELY BE THE *most*
dangerous ~~SHARPEST~~ KIND OF ESCALATION OF THE VIETNAM WAR.

L IT CARRIES A THINLY-VEILED THREAT AGAINST OUR
PARTICIPATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS.

NOW I SAY TO ANY AMERICAN WHO IS CONSIDERING
CASTING HIS VOTE FOR THE WALLACE-LE MAY TICKET:

MAKE IT YOUR BUSINESS TO KNOW JUST WHAT YOU ARE
THINKING ABOUT, ^{*voting for a*} ~~YOU ARE THINKING ABOUT~~ ^{*he voting for*} A POSSIBLE
ELECTORAL COLLEGE DEAL TO BARGAIN OFF THE PRESIDENCY.

would be voting for
~~YOU ARE THINKING ABOUT CASTING YOUR VOTE FOR~~

POLICIES THAT WOULD PUT THE WELFARE OF YOURSELF
AND YOUR CHILDREN -- AND OUR WHOLE SYSTEM -- IN
CLEAR JEOPARDY.

AND, FOR THE SAME REASON, I SAY TO ALL AMERICANS
WHO MAY NOT HAVE MADE UP THEIR MINDS, OR WHO ARE

THINKING OF NOT VOTING -- PLEASE, VOTE, *It's your Duty*
+ Privilege.

IF YOU DO NOT VOTE, YOU MAY VERY WELL BE
TURNING THIS COUNTRY OVER BY DEFAULT TO UNHEALTHY
AND DANGEROUS FORCES.

* * *

L FINALLY, I WISH TO DRAW ATTENTION TO STATEMENTS
IN VARIOUS POLICY AREAS OVER THE PAST SEVERAL DAYS BY
MR. NIXON AND HIS ADVISERS.

YESTERDAY, MR. NIXON ISSUED HIS FIRST STATEMENT
ON POLLUTION IN HIS EIGHT MONTHS OF CAMPAIGNING,

L HE PROPOSED A SIX-POINT PROGRAM -- MUCH OF WHICH

IS ALREADY IN FORCE. L I SPOKE OUT ON THIS SUBJECT AT

~~LAST~~ WITH MORE THAN TWO YEARS AGO AT GANNON COLLEGE

IN ERIE, PENNSYLVANIA AND AGAIN IN JUNE OF THIS YEAR

AT AN INTERNATIONAL POLLUTION CONFERENCE IN ST. PAUL.

L I WOULD CALL MR. NIXON'S ATTENTION TO THE FACT
THAT, WHILE HE WAS VICE PRESIDENT -- IN THOSE EIGHT

YEARS -- THE TOTAL FEDERAL BUDGET TO FIGHT WATER

POLLUTION WAS 271 MILLION DOLLARS. IN THE PAST EIGHT

DEMOCRATIC YEARS THE BUDGET HAS BEEN MORE THAN

1.5 BILLION.

L TO FIGHT AIR POLLUTION, THE NIXON REPUBLICANS
BUDGETED 25 MILLION DOLLARS IN EIGHT YEARS. WE HAVE
BUDGETED MORE THAN 273 MILLION DOLLARS IN EIGHT YEARS.

L AND WE HAVE PASSED HISTORIC LEGISLATION -- MUCH
OF IT UNDER THE LEADERSHIP OF SENATOR MUSKIE

* * *

L A FEW DAYS AGO MR. NIXON CHARGED THAT FEDERAL
INITIATIVES TO SOLVE OUR DOMESTIC PROBLEMS WERE
SAPPING PRIVATE INITIATIVE, AND THAT "AS GOVERNMENT
HAS STRAINED TO DO MORE, OUR PEOPLE HAVE FELT
CONSTRAINED TO DO LESS."

L I WOULD REFER MR. NIXON TO AN EXCELLENT LETTER-
TO-THE-EDITOR IN THIS MORNING'S WASHINGTON POST BY MR.
HYMAN BOOKBINDER, FORMERLY ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF THE
WAR ON POVERTY.

IN SUMMARY, MR. BOOKBINDER CITES IN THE SPECIFIC
ALL THE EFFORTS BEGUN IN THESE PAST EIGHT YEARS --
AND I AM PROUD TO HAVE HELPED LEAD THOSE EFFORTS --
TO BRING THE PRIVATE SECTOR AND ORDINARY PEOPLE
MORE FULLY INTO THE BUSINESS OF SOLVING THIS NATION'S
PROBLEMS. MR. NIXON HAS APPARENTLY OVERLOOKED
THE NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF BUSINESSMEN, THE URBAN
COALITION, VISTA, TEACHER CORPS, JOB CORPS AND
COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS -- AMONG OTHERS -- WHICH
HAVE AT THEIR BASE THE CONCEPT THAT PEOPLE CAN DO
A BETTER JOB OF HELPING THEMSELVES, ON THEIR OWN
INITIATIVE, THEN ANYONE CAN BY TELLING THEM WHAT
TO DO.

I SAY TO MR. NIXON: THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
MUST DO MORE. THE PRIVATE SECTOR MUST DO MORE. THE
PEOPLE MUST DO MORE. IT IS NOT A CASE OF EITHER/OR.

AND HE KNOWS IT.

* * *

IN CLOSING, I CALL ATTENTION TO A STATEMENT
BY ALAN GREENSPAN MR. NIXON'S CHIEF ECONOMIC
ADVISED, LAST WEEK IN WHICH HE SAID THAT MR. NIXON
WOULD BE WILLING TO SUSTAIN MORE UNEMPLOYMENT TO
COMBAT INFLATION.

L MR. GREENSPAN SAID THAT MR. NIXON WOULD TIP
THE SCALES MORE IN FAVOR OF PRICE STABILITY, GIVING
LESS WEIGHT TO HIGH EMPLOYMENT.

L AGAIN, IT IS NOT A CASE OF EITHER/OR.

L WE MUST HAVE BOTH PRICE STABILITY AND HIGH
EMPLOYMENT -- AND IF MR. NIXON HAD FOLLOWED THE
RECORD OF THE PAST EIGHT YEARS, HE WOULD SEE THAT IT
CAN BE DONE.

L IN THE PAST EIGHT YEARS PERSONAL INCOME --
AFTER TAXES, AND AFTER COST OF LIVING INCREASES --
HAS RISEN THREE TIMES FASTER THAN DURING THE EIGHT
NIXON YEARS.

L DURING HIS INCUMBENCY, WE HAD THREE RECESSIONS ...
AN UNEMPLOYMENT RATE OF NEARLY 7 PER CENT IN 1961,
WITH REAL INCOME FALLING ... AN ANNUAL WASTE OF
50 BILLION DOLLARS THROUGH IDLE PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY.

L JUST TODAY, I RELEASED A TASK FORCE REPORT WITH
A SPECIFIC PROGRAM TO CONTROL INFLATION.

IN THAT REPORT, I SPELL OUT EXACTLY HOW I WOULD
FIGHT INFLATION AND HAVE HIGH EMPLOYMENT. THAT
STATEMENT WAS RELEASED AND DISTRIBUTED AT 11 THIS
MORNING.

NOW LET ME HEAR FROM YOU.

#

NEWS CONFERENCE

14 OCTOBER 1968

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Mr. Sherman said to me a few moments ago -- he said some of you were asking just why was this press conference, and I said it is out of popular demand. Those that have been travelling with us have said from time to time it would be a good idea if we got together and shared our thoughts. And I thought today I might possibly be able to share some with you.

First, I have a statement I would like to read, and then we shall of course be open for questions.

We begin today by bringing you up to date on the situation concerning possible debates among the Presidential candidates.

As you know, I believe you do have the press release from the National Committee, I sent telegrams yesterday to Mr. Nixon and Mr. Wallace informing them that I had reserved an hour of television time between ten and eleven p.m. next Sunday, that is this coming Sunday, on CBS TV network, for debates among the candidates. I suggested to Mr. Wallace and Mr. Nixon, in my telegrams that they share with me the cost of the television time. But I also made it clear that if they would not share the costs, the campaign committee, my citizens committee, would find ways and means to pay the entire cost.

Thus far I have received no reply to those telegrams. Because of the necessity of making final decisions on programming, I asked for reply not later than 5 p.m. tomorrow, Tuesday.

Tomorrow night or Wednesday morning, after receiving responses, I shall have a further announcement to make concerning next Sunday night's program. That announcement will depend, of course, on the nature of the response, if any, that we receive from the other two candidates.

May I say in the meantime that I was delighted to see and hear

Governor Agnew's statement yesterday on Face the Nation that he would be willing to debate Senator Muskie if General LeMay did not participate. I have a feeling we may be making some progress.

I am not sure that Governor Agnew always speaks for Mr. Nixon, but it is possible in this instance that that could be the case, which would be news within itself.

I wish to thank in the meantime Congressman Jim O'Hara and his colleagues for their valiant help in trying to keep the debate bill alive in the Congress.

I regret the obstructive tactics by Senate Republican leadership which killed the bill. That bill had passed the House in an historic session which would have provided for the suspension of Section 315 and would have made possible a three-way debate.

Second, I want the American people to give their full attention to the platform of the Wallace-LeMay party published in this morning's press. When any American thinks for a moment about giving his vote to the Wallace-LeMay ticket rather than the tickets of the two regular parties, he should know just what the consequences of that act would be.

First of all, he would risk throwing the Presidency and the policies of the next President into a position of jeopardy.

Mr. Wallace has said time and again that if he gets enough electoral votes to keep Mr. Nixon or myself from having a majority, he will not allow the decision to go to the House of Representatives, but will use his electoral strength to bargain in the electoral college.

Now, I for one would not make any such deal with Mr. Wallace. There will not be any Humphrey-Muskie deal with Wallace, LeMay or through an intermediary like Mr. Thurmond.

Every American should know just what Mr. Wallace and General LeMay stand for aski

③

stand for aside from their tough talk statements on race and on military solutions to our problems around the world.

Their party platform does not have, for example, a civil rights plank. It would require the election of federal district judges, and would require Supreme Court judges to be reconfirmed after unstated periods., thus destroying our independent judiciary and upsetting our entire constitutional system of checks and balances.

This proposal is radical, revolutionary and incredible.

It calls for what would surely be the most dangerous kind of escalation of the Vietnam war and it carries a thinly veiled threat against our participation in the United Nations.

So I say to any American who is considering casting his vote for the third party ticket -- make it your business to know just what you are thinking about voting for. You are voting for a possible electoral college deal to bargain off the Presidency. You would be voting for policies that would put the welfare of yourself and your children and our whole system in clear jeopardy.

For the same reason I say to all Americans who may not have made up their minds or who are thinking of not voting that in this nation, this democratic republic, it is your duty to vote, as well as your privilege. There can be no opting out in this election without serious danger to our political and social system. If you do not vote, you may very well be turning this country over by default to to unhealthy and dangerous forces.

I might add that there is the extreme new left, by the way, which is advocating in some channels and some areas disruption of the voting process. This, too, cannot be condoned, and is a violation of every standard of our democracy.

So to those who are the disrupters and to those who are the

4

nay-sayers, or the persons that opt out, all I can say is that your country deserves better of the American citizen -- no matter who that citizen is or what his views.

Finally, I wish to draw attention to statements in various policy areas over the past several days by Mr. Nixon and his advisors.

It is quite clear now that there are sharp differences between the Nixon policies and the Humphrey policies -- very serious differences between the Democratic team's program, the team of Humphrey and Muskie, and the program of the Republican team of Nixon and Agnew.

Yesterday Mr. Nixon issued his first statement on pollution. In his eight months of campaigning, as far as I know his first statement on this subject of serious national interest and importance.

He proposed a six-point program, all of which is already in force.

I spoke out on this subject more than two years ago at Gannon College in Erie, Pennsylvania. And again in June of this year at the International Pollution Conference in St. Paul, Minnesota.

The Administration has already put into effect the so-called new policy position of Mr. Nixon.

I would call Mr. Nixon's attention to the fact that in those eight Republican years, of which he was a part, from 1953 to 1961, the total federal budget to fight water pollution nation-wide -- Great Lakes, smaller lakes, streams -- was \$271 million. In the past eight Democratic years, that federal budget has been more than \$1.5 billion. And presently the pollution control program is under one department in the Department of Interior in so far as water pollution is concerned.

I would also add that we have passed historic legislation, much of which is under -- has been under the leadership of the foremost

5

expert in this nation on pollution legislation, namely, Senator Edmund Muskie, who is the one man that knows more about this subject than any other member of our government.

To fight air pollution, the Nixon Republicans budgeted the grand sum total of \$25 million in eight years. We have budgeted more than \$273 million in eight years.

So Mr. Nixon's belated entry into the battle on pollution it seems to me speaks for itself. It is ill timed, late, as usual, tepid, timid and anything but effective.

Now, a few days ago Mr. Nixon charged that federal initiatives to solve our domestic problems was sapping private initiative -- and I quote him: "As government has strained to do more, our people have felt constrained to do less."

I would now refer Mr. Nixon to an excellent Letter to the Editor in this morning's Washington Post by Mr. Hyman Bookbinder, formerly Assistant Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. In summary, that letter cites, in the specific, all the efforts these past eight years. And I am proud to have helped lead these efforts, to bring the bring the private sector and ordinary people more fully into the business of solving this nation's problems. Mr. Nixon has apparently overlooked the following developments.

The National Alliance of Businessmen, which has done more to provide jobs in the last six months than all the jobs provided by the Republican Administration in eight years.

The Urban Coalition, which represents the largest single effort on the part of the private sector to deal with the crisis of our cities in our nation's history.

And then there are such programs as VISTA, the Teachers Corps, Job Corps and Community Action Programs which have at their base

(6)

the concept that people can do a better job of helping themselves on their own initiative than anyone can by telling them what to do.

So I say to Mr. Nixon the federal government has done more and must do more. The private sector has done more in the last four years than in any other time - but it still must do more. People must do more. It is not a case of either-or, and he knows it.

In closing, I call attention to the statement of Mr. Nixon's chief economic advisor -- a shocking statement and one that merely collaborates what Mr. Nixon's economic philosophy has been in the past which undoubtedly is unchanged unless it is slightly aggravated.

It was Mr. Nixon who said that he did not feel that unemployment -- over 4 -- that until unemployment reached 4.5 million, he did not feel that it reached a danger point.

Well, Mr. Allen Greenspan, his economic advisor, said last week that Mr. Nixon would be willing to sustain more unemployment to combat inflation.

I would like to ask just which workers Mr. Nixon plans on laying off. And I think it would be very important for him to tell the American people which workers he plans on having no jobs.

Mr. Greenspan said that Mr. Nixon would tip the scales more in favor of price stability, giving less weight to high employment. And again I say it is not a case of either-or -- we must have both price stability and high employment. And if Mr. Nixon had followed the record of the past eight years he would see that it can be done. In the past eight years personal income after taxes and after the cost of living increases has risen three times faster than during the eight Nixon Republican years. During his incumbency as Vice-President, in those Republican years, we had three recessions and an unemployment rate of nearly 7 per cent in 1961, with real income

7
falling and an annual waste of \$50 billion through idle productive capacity.

Just today I released a task force report with a specific program to combat and control inflation. In that report I spelled out exactly how I would proceed to fight inflation and at the same time have high employment. I believe it has been released and distributed at eleven o'clock this morning.

I merely conclude by saying that the last time that the Republican administration attempted to give this country a dose of their economics and what they call price stability, there were millions of workers in this nation without jobs, there were cities and states without revenues, there were schools that were going on half time because of inadequate facilities and inadequate revenue, there were serious social problems in every city. I do not believe that the price of Nixon economics and a Nixon victory should be higher unemployment, but apparently that is the price that is being exacted.

Alright.

Q (Inaudible)

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I plan on working just a little harder. I plan on levelling on every one of these issues. I intend to have Mr. Nixon start to spell out before the American people rather than from the beaches of Biscayne Bay, Key Biscayne, what the facts are. I want to know how much unemployment Mr. Nixon really wants for his economic program. I want to know what Mr. Nixon's views are on matters of air pollution and water pollution, and how much he is willing to spend. I want to know how much Mr. Nixon is willing to spend on crime control. I want to know what Mr. Nixon's plans are

for the cities. I want to know what Mr. Nixon's farm program is. The last one it was to get the farmers off the farm. I wonder what it is now.

I want to know what Mr. Nixon's civil rights program is. I want to know what Mr. Nixon's views are on the war in Vietnam. I want to know what he meant when he said he wanted to put the big bomb on the fire.

I want to know what the master plan for peace is. I think it is time for Mr. Nixon to come out from under the bushes -- or if he doesn't like that analogy, from under the covers. He has been sleeping with Mr. Thurmond long enough -- and he ought to let somebody else besides Mr. Agnew speak for him. Because it is confusing to have silence from Nixon and to have Mr. Agnew say what he says.

I think it is time for Mr. Nixon to be heard, and I am willing to give him a chance. But I want him to be heard in the presence of Mr. Wallace. I want Mr. Nixon to stand up and say what he thinks about Mr. Wallace and Mr. Wallace's program. I want to give them equal time, and if their hard-pressed campaign that is so financially -- under such tight financial restraints -- cannot afford it, will get some poor people that can help afford it, and we will go out and put on the program

And the invitation is here, Mr. Nixon, and it's no kid stuff. I am waiting for Mr. Nixon and Mr. Wallace to meet me Sunday night -- and it's a good time to meet, on the sabbath. We can talk soberly with restraint and responsibly about matters which relate to the welfare of this nation.

That gives you an idea of what I intend to do.

Q - - - I wonder if you would nominate Fortas as Chief Justice if you are the next President and how you feel about the \$15,000 fee that Mr. Fortas received from these five corporation executives for his lecture series.

advice of Strom Thurmond.

Q Mr. Vice-President, your campaign manager, Mr. O'Brien, said this morning that there are secret negotiations under way between the Republicans and the Wallace forces to get the Wallace votes in the election thrown into the Electoral College. What hard evidence do you have for that?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, I believe that is something that you should talk to Larry O'Brien about. I didn't make that statement. Mr. O'Brien did. But I did see Mr. Wallace's statement -- when was it -- last Monday, I believe, at the National Press Club, to the effect that -- and I mentioned it in my preliminary statement here -- that any stalemate in the electoral vote would not be settled in the House of Representatives, but in the Electoral College itself. And I have noted here on a card his exact words. This is what Wallace said. "I am not going to turn it loose to all these House members that a few do not even know who they are."

I read this only one way. That Mr. Wallace is willing to bargain his electoral vote to the highest bidder. And I made it very clear today, sir, that I am not bidding, and I am not bargaining. And I call on Mr. Nixon to publicly pledge the same. It seems to me that that is one of the things that both of us can stand for together in this election.

Q Do you know if Mr. O'Brien has any hard evidence about the secret negotiations?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: No, I do not. Mr. O'Brien does not consult me on everything nor do I consult him. I am sure that Larry O'Brien is always available for your inquiry. But I think it is quite clear that Senator Strom Thurmond is what I would call the life-line between the Nixon camp and the Wallace Camp.

advice of Strom Thurmond.

Q Mr. Vice-President, your campaign manager, Mr. O'Brien, said this morning that there are secret negotiations under way between the Republicans and the Wallace forces to get the Wallace votes in the election thrown into the Electoral College. What hard evidence do you have for that?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, I believe that is something that you should talk to Larry O'Brien about. I didn't make that statement. Mr. O'Brien did. But I did see Mr. Wallace's statement -- when was it -- last Monday, I believe, at the National Press Club, to the effect that -- and I mentioned it in my preliminary statement here -- that any stalemate in the electoral vote would not be settled in the House of Representatives, but in the Electoral College itself. And I have noted here on a card his exact words. This is what Wallace said. "I am not going to turn it loose to all these House members that I do not even know who they are."

I read this only one way. That Mr. Wallace is willing to bargain his electoral vote to the highest bidder. And I made it very clear today, sir, that I am not bidding, and I am not bargaining. And I call on Mr. Nixon to publicly pledge the same. It seems to me that that is one of the things that both of us can stand for together in this election.

Q Do you know if Mr. O'Brien has any hard evidence about the secret negotiations?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: No, I do not. Mr. O'Brien does not consult me on everything nor do I consult him. I am sure that Larry O'Brien is always available for your inquiry. But I think it is quite clear that Senator Strom Thurmond is what I would call the life-line between the Nixon camp and the Wallace Camp.

(11)

Q - - - the Vietnam talk.

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: My comment is simply this -- that it is a very sensitive issue, and I stand on what I have to say in my address at Salt Lake City over a national television network. You all have copies of that text. That was my definitive statement on Vietnam policy, and I stand with it. I have a high personal regard for Mr. Bundy and he is a man in the past whom I have gone to seek advice and counsel. But I don't think that anything would be served at this time by giving anyone any reason to be confused about my position on Vietnam. I stated it as clearly as I could, as succinctly and as openly as I could, and I leave it there.

Q Mr. Vice-President, the Sunday papers ran a couple of pieces (unintelligible) One also questions the veracity of your poll. Are the reports of your death three weeks before the election greatly exaggerated. What solid evidence would you (unintelligible)

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, I have been in public life quite a while, and I think I know the difference between something that is coming alive and something that is ebbing away. And I have seen our campaign come alive. There isn't any doubt about it. I have seen the improvement in our polls, for example, in Texas -- not polls that I have taken; polls that have been taken by the press there, polls that have been taken by the candidate for Governor there, that is not particularly heralding my qualities. The poll shows us with I believe a four per cent lead. I didn't take that poll.

The Boston Globe poll I think indicates that there is considerable support in that area.

The Nixon polls themselves indicate that it is a toss up in Ohio.

The evidence that we have from New York -- we think we have a two to four point advantage; Mr. Nixon's polls say that he has a two

point advantage. It's a scramble.

We're going down to the wire on this election.

In other words, we are in the ball game. My name is not Mickey Lolich, but I can pitch. And by the way, he's a Humphrey supporter.

Q Mr. Vice-President, sir, (unintelligible)

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I learned that the Nixon law firm has brought in a firm here in Washington, a member of which Mr. Freedman is a member of that firm and he is the counsel for the Democratic National Committee. He is not my counsel. And I have a high regard for him. But I intend to be President of the United States, not president of a law firm. I intend to be President for the people, not just for some of the people. These oil shales -- the ones I am speaking of are on public property. They are owned -- they are on federal properties. And it has been estimated that there is up to \$3 trillion worth of oil shale. And oil shale leases recently announced for competitive bids have asked for royalty rates of 14 cents a ton. Now, this could return at least \$150 billion under that type of arrangement in royalty payments over the long run, in addition to bonuses which would be bid to secure the leases.

The Secretary of Interior is handling this matter and handling it in the open. No hanky panky. No under the table arrangements. And as President of the United States I'll protect these properties. I have suggested that we would have a federal trust fund for education to be set up out of some of these revenues. And I believe that this is a sound proposal.

Now, you can't predict at the moment how soon oil shale can be brought into economic significant production.

I think it is essential therefore that there be a big plant constructed in order to bring about the technological improvements

that are needed and that this should have a high priority in the next administration.

But my answer to you is as much as I love my lawyer friends, I love my country more. And they will have to make their living their way.

I intend to be the people's lobbyist as President of the United States. And that goes for the mutual security -- that goes for the mutuals as well as the oil shales, may I say. Mr. Nixon has some very interesting clients. And I have only one client. I have got the people of the United States that I would like to represent. And I have a feeling that I will be able to protect their interests.

Q Mr. Vice-President, do you think that Senator McCarthy has opted out?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: No, sir. I do not. I do not believe that Senator McCarthy is for Mr. Nixon. I don't believe he is for Mr. Wallace. I see that he out campaigning for Democrats. And he said the other day he was for Mr. Muskie. And how can you be for Mr. Muskie and exclude me. You can't vote that way.

Q Well, how can you explain the Senator's refusal to endorse you personally.

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Senator McCarthy is an interesting personality, and you know that. And I say he is one of the refreshing spirits of American life. He just keeps you guessing.

Q What effect do you think Senator McCarthy's attitude is having on the possibility of your winning the election.

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I don't think it is going to have any particular effect. Of course, I made it very clear that I would welcome and do welcome his help and his support. But I think you know that most of his -- at least a substantial number of the

McCarthy people are actively supporting me. I am sure you know that Mr. Steve Mitchell, his chairman, is actively supporting me as vice-chairman of our Citizens Committee. Many of his young peoples leaders, the leaders of the student groups, are actively supporting my candidacy.

I feel that we will do very, very well with this support. In fact, the last ten days I have seen a crystallization of support amongst young people which is one of the most heartening developments of our campaign. I have also seen a coming together of the forces in the Democratic Party that is very heartening. I believe that we are now on the road to putting together the kind of strength in this country that can edge us through into a victory.

Q Mr. Vice-President, (unintelligible)

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: My good friend, I tried to say to the gentleman sitting next to you that as President of the United States I have but one obligation, and that is to protect the people's interest and the public interest. Private interests serve the public interest many times, most of the time. But when private interests do not serve the public interest, then the President must use the authority of his office and the prestige of his office to protect the public. And I want to make it very clear. I have been one that has long been interested in both auto safety and drug safety. I know a little bit about one and I have a reading knowledge about the other. So I think it should be clear that those laws will be vigorously and fairly enforced., without fear or favor.

Q Mr. Vice_President, would you like President Johnson to make more speeches in your behalf?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Yes, sir.

Q When and where?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Wherever he sees fit. And we have given him some good suggestions, and I hope that he shall do so. The last one, the one that he made for me last Thursday, I believe it was, was a very fine address. And his wonderful wife, Mrs. Johnson, spoke in Louisville a little over a week ago and was very helpful.

Q Do you expect him to make more speeches?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Yes, sir.

Q Mr. Vice-President ---

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Can I divide it up just a little bit?

Q Mr. Vice-President, do you see any resemblance between the 1948 campaign and the 1968 campaign -- any differences. And also, while we are on the subject, what role do you see Strom Thurmond playing in the Nixon Administration?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, let me take the later part of your question. Mr. Thurmond is quoted in the weekend papers, in the Sunday papers I believe all across the country, because it was a news service dispatch, saying that he was the spokesman for Mr. Nixon in the South. Now, I have been in the Congress sixteen years, and I watched the old Republican Southern conservative coalition stop social legislation in that Congress many of those years. I saw with the advent of John Kennedy and then with President Johnson coming to the Presidency, that we were able to overpower that coalition. But every so often it rears up again. I think that if Mr. Nixon were to be elected, that you would see a conservative reactionary coalition the likes of which you haven't seen since the 80th Congress.

I think that's what Mr. Thurmond's role will be. He will be the connection, connector between the old South -- not the new South, conservative Democrats that have left us -- some of them have, and the Republican Party.

I think Mr. Nixon's economic statements indicate just what we are talking about. I believe also that his statements on some of the social matters indicate what we are talking about.

Now, what are the similarities between now and '48? There are some -- they are not all.

Mr. Truman was an incumbent President; I think we ought to remember that. And I am not. And that 1948, there were four parties. There was the Dixiecrat Party of Mr. Strom Thurmond; there was the Progressive Party of Henry Wallace; and the two main parties, one of Mr. Dewey, the Republican, and Mr. Truman, the

Democrat.

We have today three parties, and in some areas there is a fourth party.

I believe the issues are very much the same -- the same coalition is at work.

This election is over whether or not sensible progressive liberalism will be the continuing pattern of this country or the return to reaction.

That return to reaction will be focused on the courts, on monetary policy, fiscal policy, as well as social policy.

That is what it is all about.

And if Mr. Nixon wins, it will be in a tight race, and if I win it will be in a tight race; I haven't any doubt about that.

But I do feel that there is a chance for a Democratic Congress, a good Democratic Congress. And the only way that that Democratic Congress can be overpowered is by a coalition between certain conservative Democrats and the Republicans that Mr. Nixon would bring with him.

I think that is the danger.

I don't intend to lose this election. I do not think the American people want to repudiate the progress of these past eight years. I don't think they are going to elect a President that won't stand up before the American people and tell them what he thinks. And I don't think the American people are going to turn back the clock to Mr. Wallace and I don't think they are going to let the hands be locked so that time stands still with Mr. Nixon.

I think I am going to win this election, and I intend to go out and do it.

Q Mr. Vice-President --

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Can we spread them around, Clark, if you don't mind. And I'll come back to you.

Q Mr. Vice-President, does your offer to debate (include a debate with Wallace alone if you can't get Nixon)?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: At this stage it's on all three of us. The three stand pretty -- have significant ratios in the polls. I do not want to pretend that Mr. Wallace is not a serious candidate -- he is. I think he is deadly serious. And I believe that it is in the national interest for the three of us to stand up before that camera and before you men of the press, and have it out before the American people. I do not believe that a two-man debate is as satisfactory as a three-man debate because this is a three-man election. The American people ought to see all three of us and see how we perform under pressure. Because mind you three will be pressure. I have a number of questions to ask and

I imagine I'll be asked a few.

Yes, sir, Mr. Mollenhoff.

Q You raised the question . . . I wonder in that context if you could tell us your version of the controversial Napco Industries problem in which you wrote some letters on behalf of a client of one of your lawyer friends.

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Yes, sir. I would surely be happy to. The Napco Company was from Minnesota and I was the United States Senator from Minnesota. And if you were a legitimate citizen of Minnesota and I was Senator, you could be a Republican or a Democrat and you got help. I am proud of the fact that I helped my constituents, and I even helped, may I say, some of your good friends.

Q (Inaudible)

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I'm not handling the case. I was the Senator. I helped many people, including the Minneapolis Club - the Minneapolis Athletic Club -- lots of them. I was one of the best Senators Minnesota ever had. If there was anything that they needed down in Washington and I could get it and it wasn't nailed down, I brought it home for them.

(Laughter)

Yes, sir. But I'm not running for Senator; I'm running for President. And I'm going to make sure that nobody runs off with any of the woodwork, the property or the furniture when I'm President -- I want you to know that. Any lawyer friend, past or present.

Yes, sir.

Q Mr. --

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: My goodness, what a tie you have there, first of all. I want to congratulate you. (Laughter) That's a dilly. I like a bold man. Please go ahead.

Q (What is the difference between your anti-inflation policy and the guidelines which President Johnson abandoned earlier this year)

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: The difference is that I would start out early in the new Administration -- it will be a new President, there will be a new team, there will be new people. I would immediately ask the leaders of industry and labor to come join with me to discuss how we can best obtain price stability. And then I would set up a national conference to try to work out a voluntary system of trying to achieve it. I do not say that it will be easy. But with proper fiscal measures and with the -- at least -- common policy of trying to gain the cooperation

early in the administration, the first few months of the administration, of labor and business and finance, I think we can do something about it. I believe that all segments of our country have a great stake in reasonable price stability. And we will have to weigh off what we call modest price increases with high employment. I believe that what we have had thus far by the way has not been dangerous. As a matter of fact, the recent surtax has already had an effect upon materials prices and upon wholesale food prices.

Yes, sir.

Q Can you tell us which, if any, of the present cabinet you would retain?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: No, sir, I cannot. But I can assure you that the Humphrey administration will bring to you some new faces so that you can have new acquaintances, have new discussions. We are going to have a reassessment of both domestic and foreign policy and a reassessment will be made by new takers of the inventory. And I will be in charge.

Thank you.

~~###~~

End of Transcript

Note:

Be sure to send
copies to Doug Bennet
and John Stewart



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