

## 42—RAC—L

In 1959 most Senators voted to increase Federal assistance for sewage plant construction and urban renewal.

But not Senator Goldwater.

In 1959 most Senators voted against a cut in the Housing Authority bill and, in another roll call, voted for increasing the total for public housing units.

But not Senator Goldwater.

In 1961 most Senators voted for President Kennedy's landmark omnibus Housing Act.

But not Senator Goldwater.

In 1963 most Senators supported the urban mass transit program sponsored by the great Democratic Senator from New Jersey, Harrison Williams.

But not Senator Goldwater.

And finally, in 1964 most Senators voted on the expanded housing program and on final passage of the Urban Mass Transportation Act.

But not Senator Goldwater. He never even showed up.

This is the record of retreat and reaction in the area of urban problems and housing Senator Goldwater brings to the American people in this election. This is the record the American people must evaluate in relation to the one established by the Kennedy-Johnson administration and a Democratic Congress: passage of two vital programs spearheaded by Senator Williams, mass transportation and open spaces in urban areas; expanded low-rent public housing; increased Federal assistance for local urban planning; expanded housing for the elderly; a humanized urban renewal program; moderate income rental housing; increased housing starts; and a comprehensive antipoverty program stressing local community action.

Senator Goldwater seeks to offer this country a choice. And so he does; but, what a choice.

And Senator Goldwater also offers this country an echo \* \* \* an echo from a past where 80 percent of the population lived in rural America and the problems of urban living were nonexistent.

Neither the Goldwater choice nor the Goldwater echo is sufficient to the realities of the 20th century. We have a mammoth job ahead if we are to make our cities habitable, not only in a physical and material sense, but—of greater importance—in a personal and spiritual sense. We must set about making our cities just and joyful communities in the fullest meaning of the word.

The American people possess the courage, vision, and determination to seek the Great Society where—in the words of President Johnson—"every man can \* \* \* follow the pursuit of happiness—not just security, but achievement, excellence, and fulfillment of spirit."

We will do this by giving an overwhelming mandate this fall to Lyndon B. Johnson and the Democratic Party.

### Article

News release from office of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Washington, D.C.

September 10, 1964

### HUMPHREY HITS "COW PALACE CHAOS" OF GOLDWATER TAX PROPOSALS

(Following are remarks prepared for delivery on the Senate floor today (September 10) by Senator Hubert Humphrey in reply to tax-cut proposals by Senator Barry Goldwater, Republican presidential candidate.)

Senator Goldwater is a man of many contradictions. He talks of reducing Government expenditures while simultaneously proposing the largest peacetime spending program in our Nation's history.

He voted against a tax-reduction measure in January and by September has proposed one of his own. And the day after he proposed his own 25-percent tax cut, he denounced the tax cut approved by Congress as a "cynical scheme" that was "impulsive, massive, politically motivated tax-cut gimmickry."

The lesson of all this is clear. The national budgets and fiscal policy cannot be formulated in the chaos of the Cow Palace or in the cabin of Senator Goldwater's jet plane.

## 43—RAC—L

I know the American people are waiting and anxious to learn how Senator Goldwater plans to increase spending, reduce revenues, and balance the budget at the same time.

If Senator Goldwater would trade in his ham radio for an adding machine, he would discover to his astonishment that his tax and expenditure commitment would add up to the biggest Federal deficit in peacetime history.

Where does the Senator stand on Government spending? Adding up the costs of the promises of the 1964 Republican platform in the area of military and related items, Senator Goldwater is committed to the following expenditures:

He would develop and procure—at a cost of about \$10 billion—a new manned bomber in place of the B-52.

He would spend at least \$7 billion a year more than is now being spent on military research and development.

He proposes an antiballistic missile system around our cities at a cost of not less than \$20 billion. Since this system would be of little value without fallout shelters, we would have to add at least \$2 billion of Federal funds for a shelter program.

He would expand our \$1½ billion military space program, build another \$400 million nuclear aircraft carrier, and reactivate military bases which have been closed as obsolete and unnecessary.

He would urgently spend over \$1 billion for the central Arizona project in his home State.

This program, at a rockbottom minimum, would increase Federal spending by over \$5 billion a year or \$25 billion in the next 5 years. By pure coincidence, this is the annual amount by which the Republican platform pledges to reduce Federal spending.

But this is only half the story. He is also promising automated revenue reductions despite the fact that earlier this year he voted against the \$11½ billion tax cut supported by 70 percent of the Republicans and 84 percent of the Democrats in the U.S. Senate.

Having thus changed his mind suddenly on still another major issue, here is what he proposes at least for the moment:

First, he wants income tax credits for medical and hospital insurance for the elderly, for college education costs, and—just to be sure no one is overlooked—for modernization of fishing vessels. Probable cost: Not less than \$3 billion a year.

Second, he advocates the removal of a specified list of excise taxes. Cost: \$500 million annually.

Third, he urges the transfer of certain Federal excises and other tax sources to the States: Probable cost: \$1 to \$2 billion annually.

Fourth, having got in the spirit of the thing, he now offers an income tax cut increasing from 5 percent in the first year to 25 percent in the fifth. First-year cost: \$3¾ billion.

Now let's add up his proposed outlay and income. A \$5 billion increase in expenditures, added to a first-year cut in Federal tax revenues of \$8¼ to \$9¼ billion means an increase in the fiscal 1966 deficit of about \$13 to \$14 billion. Add this to the deficit of about \$3 billion which might be expected in the absence of the Goldwater program, and there is a total deficit for 1966 of \$16 to \$17 billion—far greater than the previous peacetime record of \$12½ billion in 1959.

This massive deficit—exploding on an economy already approaching full employment—would wreck the economy and set off an orgy of inflation. It would reverse 3 years of progress in our balance of payments and spur the flight of gold abroad. When it was all over, an inventory of the vaults at Fort Knox would disclose not gold but water.

Over the course of the next 5 years he is proposing a cumulative revenue loss, based on the four points listed above, of about \$90 billion. He is also going to swell Federal spending to an alltime high.

No matter how thick or thin the Senator slices his fiscal and tax policy, it is still baloney.

## 44—RAC—L

Watertown, S. Dak.  
Watertown Airport  
September 11, 1964

### PRESS CONFERENCE OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator McGovern. Ladies and gentlemen, this is one of the proudest moments in the life of South Dakota, when we can welcome to Watertown and to his native State, the next Vice President of the United States, Senator Hubert Humphrey.

I know the press have some questions for him. Without any further delay, I am going to put him on.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, George.

My friends of Codington County, and relatives—there are about half of each here today—I hope relatives are friends, too—Mayor Roby, our good friend, C. L. Chase, our candidate on the Democratic ticket who ought to be and will be the next Governor of South Dakota; Mr. Lindley, and all the officers of the county committee and the State committee that are here and our friends of the press, first of all, I want to say to our friends who came out from Washington, we should have checked the weather before we left. It was hot and sultry in Washington this morning, and it is crisp and cool, it is just good, Democratic victory weather out here in South Dakota.

Having said that, I turn myself over to the tender mercies of the press, radio, and television here.

QUESTION. Senator, one of the big issues right here now, as you undoubtedly know, is the National Farmers Organization holding action, and so on. Do you see any chance of permanent benefit to the farmer through this withholding action?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, it is my view that our farmers can do a great deal to help themselves through the building of their cooperatives, through, of course, the strengthening of our farm laws that aid a great deal in the maintenance of a fair place in the marketplace. I am going to address myself to these matters in my remarks at the auditorium today when I speak this noon.

We surely do need farm organization, and I would hope that our great farm organizations might be able to pool their efforts into one constructive program.

Regrettably, one of the things that has injured the cause of agriculture thus far is the division in the great farm organizations. Therefore, whatever can be done to bring these organizations into closer harmony as to objectives and as to means of achieving those objectives will be very, very helpful.

QUESTION. Senator, which do you consider your home State? Is it Minnesota or South Dakota?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, my home State, of course, is Minnesota. My native State is South Dakota. But I just love the whole country so much that I wish I could have lived in each and every one of the 50 States.

But I was born in Codington County—my birth certificate is on file here at the courthouse—on that day of May 27, 1911, at Wallace, S. Dak., a nearby community and a fine rural community, where my father had a drugstore. I was born above that drugstore and, as Bob said, raised inside it.

QUESTION. Senator, do you favor immediate implementation of the Supreme Court's ruling on legislative reapportionment? If you do, how are you going to explain that stand here in South Dakota or throughout the Midwestern States?

Senator HUMPHREY. No, I have joined my colleague in the Senate, Senator McCarthy, in offering a resolution in the Senate called the sense of the Congress, which recognizes, of course, the jurisdiction of the Court, I do not believe there is any doubt about that, but also recognizes that the matter of reapportionment requires what the Court once said in its famous desegregation decision, deliberate speed. It means some time, giving our courts, giving legislatures the opportunity to fulfill their constitutional requirement of equal representation.

## 45—RAC—L

Our "sense of Congress" resolution would not violate any of the relationships between the branches of Government, but at the same time, would express the sense of the Congress that the Court's decision, while valid, should be permitted to be brought into effect over a short but reasonable period of time.

QUESTION. What do you foresee as the outcome of the election right here in South Dakota? Do you have a feeling of it yet?

Senator HUMPHREY. Mr. Mazo, we are very gratified by the recent public opinion poll that was in the news this morning in South Dakota. Having been interested in the development of South Dakota politically and economically all of my life. I don't recall any time in my memory at least when a political public opinion poll showed such a margin of strength for the Democratic Party and the Democratic candidate. I am very pleased that the folks in South Dakota have expressed, at least in the public opinion sampling, this great confidence in President Johnson and in their native son, Hubert Humphrey. Nothing could be more gratifying to me.

QUESTION. What do you think of the tone of the campaign being waged by Mr. Goldwater and Mr. Miller?

Senator HUMPHREY. Mr. Scherer, I felt that the speech of Mr. Goldwater last evening in Minneapolis represented a kind of sense of desperation on his part. Everybody in this Nation that is a decent citizen believes in law and order. Every one of us that have been public officials support law and order.

And it is, it seems to me, the responsibility of a national candidate—that is, a candidate for the office of President or Vice President—to encourage observance of the law, to speak in such a manner as to encourage every citizen to want to do better, to want to play a constructive role in the life of the community.

I don't believe that it helps to condemn, if only indirectly, but nevertheless to condemn, every mayor, every chief of police, every sheriff, every police officer, including, may I say, the investigatory services such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation, all of which have been reflected upon adversely by the constant comments of the Republican candidate that America is a lawless Nation. I do not think America is lawless. I think the American people in the main are law-abiding.

For the few that violate the law, there are millions that adhere to the law and support the law.

I would hope that Senator Goldwater would speak up for the observance of the law, including the civil rights law, rather than to say that it breeds hatred and violence. It does not breed hatred and violence. It is a doctrine of voluntary compliance, basing its major effect upon local community action in observance of the law.

Any man that seeks to be President of the United States should seek to raise the level of citizen conduct and citizen performance, rather than to chastize every community, every officer of—every public officer, which is apparently what has been done in these recent utterances.

QUESTION. Senator, what is your feeling about reopening the Bobby Baker investigation?

Senator HUMPHREY. It has been reopened. I so voted yesterday. Anyone else?

QUESTION. Senator, what will the Rules Committee find out about the Bobby Baker case the second time that it didn't the first time?

Senator HUMPHREY. I couldn't say until they hold the hearings, sir.

QUESTION. What reason have we to suspect they will find out anything more?

Senator HUMPHREY. I couldn't say. I have some qualities, but one of them is not extrasensory. I really am not a prophet and able to look into the future. However, any misdoing that is brought to the attention of that committee will be exposed.

May I add, one of the most potent and reliable agencies of this Government, namely, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, is conducting a sweeping investigation of every allegation and every charge. I wouldn't be surprised if they didn't do a better job of it than Senators who are in betwixt politicking and committee hearings, and most of the time in recent days, politicking.

I believe that is all.

QUESTION. Do you have any opinion at this time on the agricultural withholding?



## 46—RAC—L

Senator HUMPHREY. I expressed some answer about this earlier. I have very serious doubts as to whether limited actions such as this really have much effect on the market.

I think the program that the Government has initiated in the matter of supporting the beef price is much more effective.

QUESTION. Thank you.

Watertown, S. Dak  
Civic Arena  
September 11, 1964

### REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, Senator George McGovern, my friend and neighbor, and may I express also my thanks to the mayor of this great and fine city, Watertown, S. Dak., Mr. Roby, for his gracious and generous hospitable reception and introduction. And I surely want to thank this fine band. I think they deserve a good hand of applause. [Applause.]

You learned how to play the "Minnesota Rouser" almost as good as the Golden Gophers Band. I hope you will just keep practicing it every day between now and November 3. [Applause.]

Permit me just once again to express my great pleasure in seeing an old friend and a fine man who is about to become the new Governor of the State of South Dakota, Mr. John F. Lindley.

Permit me to say, John, welcome to the folds of victory. We are expecting you out there in the statehouse. [Applause.]

As I recall, the first Governor to occupy the Governor's mansion out at Pierre was a Democrat and they tell me that Republicans have never liked it, and I see no reason to keep them in it.

So, John, we will put you there. [Applause.]

And may I say that I was delighted to meet here at the entrance to this great auditorium the man we want to see elected and who can be elected with your help and your enthusiastic support to represent this East River district of South Dakota in Congress, George E. May.

George, my best wishes. [Applause.]

It is always good to be on the same platform with a friend of the family, a friend of my father, my mother, a friend of all of us, my old friend, C. L. Chase. I just want to wish him the very, very best. I hope that we may have him with us as a leader in the Democratic ranks for years and years to come. [Applause.]

Now, I want to say a word to our friends of the press who came so far from way back East and those of you who are here from the Midwest. Most of the folks you see up here on this platform are relatives. I have built-in political strength in this State, I want you to know, and I like it that they turned out—I won't say en masse because, frankly, there are many more. We kept them working at the precinct level while most of them are out here enjoying life.

I want to thank each and every one of them for helping bring me up, so to speak. It does me so much good to see them. We have real family spirit in our family, and I love each and every one of them. I am so pleased that they are here. And I am so pleased that even the few of them who had at one time wandered into those paths of political indecision and political doubt called Republicanism have now found the straight and narrow path of the Democratic Party. [Applause.]

This is a great auditorium. This community is to be commended for this wonderful, wonderful facility, and I would be less than honest with you if I didn't tell you that I was very concerned at having a meeting at high noon in a busy countryside, and in a fine busy city. I was concerned as to whether we would have such a splendid large audience. I am delighted. I am so happy and I want to thank every person here for your attendance today and for your willingness to join us on this occasion.

I wanted to come back to my native State to initiate at least in the early stages of this campaign—last week, Mrs. Humphrey and I and our family were in our home State, Minnesota. We were in Minneapolis and St. Paul, where we received a wonderful welcome from

## 17—RAC—L

friends and neighbors. Then we went out to the little community where we now reside and have our voting residence and our home, our Minnesota home. And we had several thousand people out in this little village, country village of less than 600 people. It was good to come home. It was good, as I said then and I say now, to touch the earth and to feel the hand of friendship and fellowship. Because in public life, strange as it may seem, with all of the crowds and all of the commotion, it is a lonely life. Sometimes you have all too little time with friends. In fact, most of the time too little time with friends and so often, so little time with your loved ones, your family. And when you lose a little of your faith even in yourself or the things for which you are working, when you become tired and distressed, you like to come home. And when you want inspiration, when you want a good start, when you want the kind of energy that gives you sustenance over the long period, you want to come home. And when I come back here to South Dakota, to Codington County where I was born some 53 years ago, I feel I am at home, because my name is registered here in the official archives of this country as Hubert H. Humphrey, Jr., son of Hubert Humphrey and Christine Humphrey, born May 27, 1911. I am proud that I was born in this wonderful Midwestern State of South Dakota, where we judge people on merit, where we are proud of the greatest resource that any community can have, namely, a resource of the human being—his mind, his heart, his body, his soul, his spirit. And you have it, my dear friends. This is what makes South Dakota, and I commend you. [Applause.]

I return here accompanied by not only my family—they are not all with us today; my daughter and her two children couldn't be with us, our youngest son couldn't be with us, but Bob is here, Skip and his wife are here, our son-in-law, Bruce, is here; Muriel is here. So we have a pretty good representation of family.

But I am pleased, too, that I can come with my neighbor, the man and the wife that you sent to Washington to represent you in the U.S. Senate. And I say from this platform as I have said a dozen times or more in this eastern part of South Dakota in years before, there is no finer public servant in Washington, D.C., now or in the past, and likely in the years to come, than Senator George McGovern of South Dakota. [Applause.]

George and Eleanor are our friends. Their family and our family are friends. We are neighbors, we are friends, and we are fellow Democrats, and we love the people of this great State.

Now, George, I speak for both of us today, because what I am about to say now I discussed with you on the plane as we came out from Washington this morning. We are back here to give to the people of South Dakota in the few moments that you have provided us a performance report, a performance report on the Kennedy-Johnson administration, because pledges were made in 1960 by Senator McGovern, by Hubert Humphrey, by the late and beloved President, John F. Kennedy, and by the Vice President of the United States at that time, Lyndon Johnson, and now our President. Every one of us was in this State and each of us made a set of commitments and promises to the people of our State. And I am here to report faithfully to you that those pledges and those promises were not only made, they have been kept and they have been carried out.

You may remember that cold day in January 1961, Inaugural Day. You will remember that the day before there was a blizzard in Washington, which I think was somewhat indicative of what had been going on in Washington, the confusion, the slip and the slide—one step forward, two steps backward and a slide to the left and a slide to the right and a twist and a twirl were about what we had been going through. Then on that day of January 20, 1961, a young man, young of heart, bright of mind, good of soul and spirit, stood before the American people, took his oath of office and delivered a magnificent inaugural address, an address that commanded the attention not only of the people of America but of the whole world. In that address, he minded us of the situation that then prevailed and where we were going, a Nation whose economy was limping along in 1960, and that was the fact. That Nation that was limping along in 1960 now has the quickened pace of a strong, vital, free enterprise system, encouraged by a government that is interested in the people and inspired by confidence as the result of the actions of the Government.

## 48—RAC—L

In less than 4 years, our beloved America, the pride of our hearts and, indeed, the miracle of the world, this beloved America has expanded its economy until today, it is running at a rate of over \$600 billion a year, and in fact, we have added over \$150 billion of new production, of goods and services in these last 3½ years. What a record! [Applause.]

Now, this is what President Kennedy meant when he said, "Let's get this country moving again," and when he said, "Let's get America moving again." He gave us a command and that command was joined in by his partner, Lyndon Johnson.

What was the command? "Let us begin."

No more of this Sleepy Hollow melodrama. No more of this apathy and economic paralysis. But get America moving: Let us begin.

The spirit of youth, of vitality. And we started to get America moving again.

And are we moving? We are moving indeed. And we are moving forward, every one of us. And we are moving forward together—government, business, agriculture, labor, people everywhere; all of us together are building a stronger America, and that is the kind of leadership that America deserves and needs, a leadership that builds and constructs.

Yet I listen to the voice of the opposition and the voice of the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party. And what does he do? He tells us of the tyranny of your Government, the Federal Government, a government of law, a constitutional government, a government of a republic, a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. He tells us that there is a war going on between Federal and State governments. He seeks to divide worker from farmer, city from country, State from locality, National Government from State government. And that kind of divisive talk is unworthy of talk, is unworthy of a Nation that is known as the United States of America, one Nation inseparable, one Union, one people. What America needs today is a voice that asks us to stand together, to work together, to build together; not a voice that pits one group against another; not a voice that denies, if you please, the basic unity of our Nation.

I am happy to say that President Lyndon Johnson is known not only in Washington, but is known throughout this land as one that brings people together, that brings together labor and business, that brings together farmer and city, that brings together the 50 States of this Union, and that brings together the nations of the free world in a great alliance. That is the kind of leadership America needs. [Applause.]

The economic facts of 1964 tell us the story of what has happened these past 3½ years. Those economic facts tell us that America is enjoying unprecedented prosperity, unprecedented production, high employment—the highest in the Nation's history—good profits for the Nation's industry, and heavy investment on the part of our management and financiers. The country is filled with optimism. Everybody is optimistic except Barry. [Applause.]

He started out not liking the whole thing and he is determined to stick to it. Everybody in America is confident of the future except the man that says it is a fake, and he charges us today with a fake prosperity. Well, let him tell the president of General Motors that, whose profits are unprecedented this year.

Is it any wonder that the leaders of business are abandoning this false prophet? Is it any wonder that leaders of business, traditionally Republican, are now joining by the hundreds the Johnson-Humphrey team for the election and the victory that will be ours on November 3, 1964?

American business is not going to turn this country over to the uncertain hands of one who can't differentiate between what is real and what is false. And I don't believe, my friends, that when you are winning the ball game and gaining the victory, you change captains or quarterbacks in the middle of the game, or that you even change the signals, particularly when you wear glasses without lenses.

And I don't believe you ought to give the ball to a fellow that only runs backwards.

## 49—RAC—L

But, my friends, we are not content with just yesterday's glories, yesterday's victories. Nor are we going around in ashes and sackcloth and talking about just our problems and our difficulties. We are going to talk about our challenges and we are going to talk about our opportunities. Because if there is one thing that America ought to stand for, my fellow Americans, and particularly may I say to our young friends today, America ought to stand for and ought to symbolize opportunity—opportunity. The chance to make something out of your life, the chance to be someone, the chance to do something, the opportunity to live the good life.

So we are not going to rest on our laurels. We are not going to look over yesterday's scores and cheer about the victories that we have already done. Because there are things to be done yet in this great land of ours. There are, in the words of the poet, miles to go before we sleep. There are yet victories to be won; there are wrongs to be righted, and there are inequities to be overcome. And we are at the business of righting those wrongs and of conquering those inequities.

The last 4 years have represented real gains for American agriculture, but we know there is yet much to be done. American farmers deserve a better deal and rural America needs a friendly and sympathetic government. Rural America doesn't need a President that has never understood agriculture any time in his public career.

In fact, I must say for the candidate of the opposition party that he is incredibly candid on occasion. He is the man who said publicly that he doesn't know anything about farming. I agree.

Now, the American farmer needs someone who does know something about agriculture, needs someone, if you please, that at least knows that agriculture has not fully shared in this national prosperity. The American farmer needs a break, a fair break in the marketplace. He needs to share this economy on the basis of equality, he needs help from his Government. He needs cooperation from his Government. And we intend to see to it that that cooperation is ever forthcoming.

American agriculture has been in the forefront of this administration's action program. For example, our surplus food has been made available to the needy and the hungry. We have a food stamp plan in operation, one that Senator McGovern and Hubert Humphrey and others like us helped perfect and pass in the Congress of the United States without the help, may I say, of the temporary spokesman of the Goldwater faction of the Republican Party.

We have the feed grains program at work in the field, on your farm, and it is bringing in new income, but not with the vote of the temporary spokesman of the Goldwater faction of the Republican Party. He voted no.

We have a voluntary wheat program which provides new income for our wheat farmers, but it didn't come about because of the inspiring leadership of the aspirant of the Republican Party; not on your life. He voted no, and I hope every wheat farmer in South Dakota remembers it.

And there is a greatly expanded food-for-peace program, and every farmer, every producer of food and fiber in America should be proud of the fact that it is our food today which is one of the great margins of strength on our side in the world struggle. Food, American food, saves lives. Food, American food, saves freedom. Food, American food, is a part of a great economic program abroad. And the farmers of South Dakota and Minnesota and other States have been patriots in the fullest sense of the word. They have, indeed, produced the new weapons of a peaceful world, the weapon of food for peace and food for people. And I, as one who has worked for it, and your Senator who is the administrator of that program, I believe that we have the right to say that the job has been well done. But without the help, may I say, of the gentleman from Arizona.

There is the school lunch, the free milk program. There is a broad program of aid with our cattlemen, which today is stabilizing the price of meat. These are the programs of this administration and with few exceptions, my fellow citizens, these programs have been legislated over the firm and resolute resistance of the temporary spokesman of the Grand Old Party.



## 50—RAC—L

I want to say right now that we welcome into our ranks, in fact we extend the hand of fellowship and welcome, to the thousands and thousands of good Republicans who have fought for what was their belief and what was their convictions. The fact of the matter is that the Democrats have treated the Republicans better than the Goldwater faction of the Republican Party has treated their own. And we welcome into our ranks today and tonight and in the weeks ahead, the thousands—nay, I think the millions—of liberal, modern, progressive, constructive, Republicans who put their country above their party and are going to vote for Lyndon B. Johnson for President of the United States.

There are many other things that I want to comment on on this agriculture front. The rural area development program. That was nothing but a dusty folder on a shelf in the Department of Agriculture until President Kennedy and President Johnson put it to work. The Farmers Home Administration, capital credit enabled them in ever-increasing amounts and the lights are on all over rural America, too. And REA, rural electric cooperatives, REA is stronger and more effective today than ever before. And these programs are yours. Keep them.

Now, together, we shall guarantee that rural America is not only a place in which you can earn a good income but, more important, a place in which you can live the good life, the good earth and good people make up a good society.

South Dakota farmers, indeed all South Dakotans, in the cities, and on the farms, have benefited from the many programs of these past 31½ years. If there is any one place where we know the doctrine of interdependence, it is here. Every merchant on Main Street depends on agricultural income. What is good for that farmer is good for that druggist. What is good for that farmer is good for that hardware store. What is good for that farmer is good for that filling station. It is all together. The doctrine of interdependence is written across the map of South Dakota. That is why when you have a candidate or aspirant for public office that has forsaken you, that has refused to ever consider your problems and, frankly confesses that he knows nothing about farming, then I say he has little or nothing to contribute to the well-being of this State.

The tax cut which the Congress passed gave you new spendable income. But the Republican candidate, the faction candidate, did not vote for it. Aid to education has strengthened our colleges, made possible their expansion. Area redevelopment and public works, conservation, reclamation, and irrigation legislation, all have benefited every citizen of this State.

Beyond these economic gains, my friends, we have taken long strides in the pursuit of peace. And this is the fundamental issue of our lives. The question before the American people in this election is simple and direct and profound: Which of the two candidates is best equipped by experience, by background, by intellect, by emotion to give this Nation and the free world the leadership that it needs in the coming years? Which of the two? Which of these men do you want to have his hand on the nuclear trigger? Which one do you trust?

And as our President said only the other day in Detroit, Mich., the responsibility for the nuclear weapon, the responsibility for the ultimate security of this Nation can't be, may I say, can't be delegated to a colonel or a general in the field; it must be only in the hands of the President of the United States in Washington, D.C.

So our great goal is the pursuit of peace. Our Nation today is powerful, more powerful than all the nations of the world put together. The power that our Nation has, may I say to our young people, is so staggering that it is almost beyond human comprehension. Yet within less than 1 hour, if there is miscalculation, if there is rashness, or if there is irresponsibility or if there is poor judgment, within less than 1 hour, mothers and fathers, 100 million of us, could be ashes by one nuclear attack. We are not talking about little things these days. We are talking about life itself. We are talking about the future of this planet; we are talking, if you please, about the salvation of the species, not merely some of the trivia which is all too often spread across the land in a political campaign.

## 51—RAC—L

So let us thank God that today our Nation is mighty and strong, because that strength is used for peace; that our allies are strong and prosperous. And let us remember, too, that our adversaries are disorganized. They are split and they are on the defense. And I don't think it helps America, and I don't think it helps the cause of freedom for the spokesman of the opposition to run up and down this land telling us how the Communists are winning. They don't need any propagandists on the American political scene.

The air that we breathe today is clean and the milk that we drink today is pure because a President of the United States had the vision and had the courage to negotiate with the Soviet Union and other countries a nuclear test-ban treaty to stop the testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere. This was an act of mercy; this was an act of humanity; this was an act of peace; this was an act, if you please, to forestall a terrible day of conflict. Yet the man who talks today and asks for your vote and who would have you believe that he is for a better America and a peaceful world—that man, the Senator from Arizona—voted no on that great fundamental issue.

The United Nations, the United Nations, which is the hope of peace, the United Nations which is man's most important instrument in the pursuit of peace, requires the constant attention, the constant strength of America. And the United Nations has given much of the peacekeeping operations of this world. When the hour came when the United Nations had to have the capital to continue its functions of peacekeeping, the whole peace, and when your America, through its Government, voted to give that money to the United Nations, where was the Senator from Arizona? He was in the opposition.

I cannot forgive these acts of public opposition, a record of no, no, no, a thousand times no; a record of retreat, retreat, retreat, back away from reality. This is no way to give leadership to our great, young, and vital America.

Peace, we know, is a process and it has to be pursued relentlessly and it requires courage and it requires sacrifice and it requires confidence and vision. Peace is indeed a journey of a thousand miles. But we now know the direction. We see our goal, and we, as Americans, Republicans and Democrats, whatever our political persuasion, we are determined to reach that goal and with God's help and with the confidence of the American people, we will pursue relentlessly the path of peace until the goal of a peaceful and free and just world is achieved.

Thank you very much.

Excerpts  
Watertown, S. Dak.  
September 11, 1964

### REMARKS BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

I return to my native State of South Dakota and to the county in which I was born. I return accompanied by my good friend and neighbor and your outstanding U.S. Senator, George McGovern. The McGoverns and the Humphreys—parents and children—are more than fellow Democrats. We are the closest of friends and neighbors in the truest sense of the word.

Senator McGovern and I come back to South Dakota to give a performance report on the Kennedy-Johnson administration. Pledges were made in 1960 and promises were given. Those pledges and promises have been carried out.

A nation whose economy was limping along in 1960 now has the quickened pace of a strong, vital, free enterprise system, encouraged by Government and inspired by confidence. In less than 4 years our America has increased its gross national product by over 115 billion dollars.

This is what the Kennedy-Johnson administration means when it said, "let's get this country moving again." We are moving and we are moving forward. All of us together—Government, business, agriculture, labor, people everywhere—are building a stronger and better America.

## 52—RAC—L

The economic facts of 1964 tell one story—that America is enjoying unprecedented prosperity, unprecedented production, high employment, good profits, and heavy investment. The country is filled with optimism and confidence. And I don't believe that when you are winning the game and gaining the victory that you change captains or even change the signals. Surely we don't want to hand the ball to a player who runs backward.

But we are not a party or a country that is content with yesterday's achievements. There are miles to go before we sleep—there are victories to be won—wrongs to be righted—and inequities to be overcome.

These last 4 years have represented real gains for American agriculture, but there is much yet to be done. America's farmers deserve a better deal. Rural America needs a friendly and sympathetic government. And the American farmer needs a fair break in the marketplace. He needs to share in this economy on the basis of equality. And we intend to see that this is done.

American agriculture has been in the forefront of the action program of the Democratic administration. Our surplus food has been made available to the needy and the hungry. A food stamp plan is in operation. Feed grains program increases farm income. The voluntary wheat program provides new income for our wheat farmers. There is a greatly expanded food-for-peace program that strengthens our Nation at home and abroad. There is an expanded school lunch and special milk program. And there is a broad program of aid to and cooperation with our cattlemen, strengthening the price of beef products.

And add to this the rural areas development program that was but a dusty folder on the shelf in the Department of Agriculture in 1960 and now is an active working program in thousands of counties across the Nation.

Through the Farmers Home Administration capital and credit have been made available in ever increasing amounts for a modern agriculture. The lights are on all over rural America—and REA is stronger and more effective today than ever before.

Together we shall guarantee that rural America is not only a place in which you earn a good income, but a place in which you live the good life. The good earth and good people make a good society.

South Dakota farmers—indeed all South Dakotans in the cities, the towns, and the farms—have benefited from the many programs of these past 3½ years.

The tax cut gave you new spendable income. The aid to education has strengthened our colleges and made possible their expansion. Area redevelopment and public works, conservation, reclamation and irrigation legislation—all have benefited every South Dakotan and indeed every American.

Beyond these economic gains at home, we have taken long strides in the pursuit of peace. Our Nation is powerful and mighty. Our allies are strong and prosperous. Our adversaries are disorganized, split, and on the defense. The air we breathe is cleaner because a President of the United States had the vision and the courage to negotiate a nuclear test ban treaty. The United Nations lives on because this country and this Government is a staunch defense and a willing protector. The markets of the world are open and growing because of our trade expansion programs.

Peace is a process to be pursued. It requires courage and sacrifice. Peace is indeed a journey of a thousand miles, but we are on the way. We know the direction. We see our goal. And we are determined to reach it.

Doland, S. Dak.  
September 11, 1964

### REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, Senator McGovern. May I thank this enthusiastic, vitalized, energetic cheering section that we have here. This bodes well for the Doland High School basketball team and football team and debate team and all the other teams. If you have as much punch on the field as you have in the cheering section, you are already the champs, district, region, and State.

## 53—RAC—L

Mayor Hofer, my classmates that were here with me today, and my eighth grade teacher, Miss Eireman, I want to swear you to an oath of silence on the various activities that I may have engaged in, particularly you, Deschler, and Homer. You start telling on me and I am going to tell on you.

I am just so thrilled at the homecoming that we are having here that it is very difficult to even express myself. I want you to notice that to go to Doland High School today and to visit once again the classroom and see the gym, just walk through those halls that were literally, if not my home, a very important part of my home, 12 years from the first grade through the senior year—to do that was the sort of experience that grips your heart. No matter how much public speaking you may have done, no matter how many articles you may have written, no matter how many things you may have said, you never can find the right word at this time to express the thanks and the emotions that are in one's heart and spirit.

I guess the best thing for me to say is that I love the people that are here, those that preceded you, and when I go back to the old familiar places, my heart is filled to overflowing.

As I have said on one or two other occasions, my cup of appreciation runneth over.

Now, I want to say to Ervin Herther that we have to stick together on the prowess and the formidable qualities of the Doland athletic teams. I have spread the news throughout this fair land—in fact, in foreign countries—that when it comes to competitive spirit, win, lose, or draw, there never was a town that was any better than Doland, S. Dak.

I want to say that there are many improvements. First of all, the band is a lot better band than I remember. They look better and they play better, and I can remember that I was in the local band here for awhile. They were a little short of talent and I used to work over here in the family drugstore, where it says West Side Cafe, now, Wells Hardware Store used to be right next door and that was the Security State Bank where it says The Mary Jo. The telephone exchange was right up there on the side. I can remember when they used to have band concerts out here in the middle of the street and they got a little hard up for a baritone horn player one time. I guess I got one or two lessons and they put me in. The only number I could play was the Washington Post March. As I recall, there were only two or three chords or notes that you had to notice. I was good at it; at least I was loud. But when they got hard up for a bass drummer, the best you had to do at that time to qualify was to keep time, and since you were setting the pace you could always blame others if things didn't come out right, you see.

I look down this main street and I remember when I thought it was the biggest main street in the world and, as a matter of fact, it is pretty big at that.

I can remember when they built that hotel over there. If my father were here, he could tell you he remembers, too, because they lost some money. But it is there. That is part of the way we built America. Some people had to take a chance, some people had to be willing to risk a little money, a little time, a little energy.

I met my friend Bill James here and his mother. I remember James' Garage, and I remember Art James. I remember when he and my dad used to argue politics; as a matter of fact, everybody argued politics with dad, didn't they? I was sort of brought up on it. We had oatmeal for breakfast and politics all day. I guess that is the way I got started in politics.

But this isn't going to be any speech. It is just going to be a few reminiscences, a few memories.

I would like to say that the great treasure of this community has been in its people. This isn't from an esthetic point of view in terms of the beauty of the landscape or fine paintings or architecture. I suppose you couldn't say that Doland would stack up with Rome or Washington, D.C., or Paris. But I will tell you, there are some wonderful people in this community and the memory that I have of



## 54—RAC—L

Doland is not about buildings or even about this little park right over here. I remember when that park was dedicated. It isn't about the buildings, it isn't about the street. Yet I can remember when Doland had one of the first gravel streets of any of the communities in these parts.

But what I remember about is old Doc Sherwood, for example, who is no longer with us physically. His office used to be right above the drugstore. He could cure you even if he didn't have any medicine. He just sort of held your hand and said, "You are getting well," and you did, most of the time.

I can remember Doc Williams, who used to be down on the other corner. There was Smith's Drug Store down there and Humphrey's Drug Store over here. We have always had competition in our family, for some reason or the other.

I remember, for example, these great names that you see up here, Fargo and Riske, and the Garthwaite and La Brie. I remember that this community was filled with people that were the salt of the earth and it still is. I hope that the young people of this school will recollect some of these names or remember some of these names, because I don't know of any community, and I have lived in a lot of them, where there was as much yearning for education, as much basic culture, a lot of good things, as much genuine religion and as much loyalty as this community of Doland, a great place. That is what it takes to make a great country.

Now, I have bragged on this town, as I have said, all over. My children—some of them are here with me today, and I wanted them to come here because I have told them about Doland. They have heard so much about it that they have become a little weary of it, I might add. I told their mother a lot about it, too. She was a big city girl; she is from Huron, S. Dak. We folks were always a little suspicious of those big city folk, you know.

But truly, I have told Muriel, who is here with us, and I know she will want to say a word here later on—I have told Muriel about Doland and its people. I have reminded her when we took the measure of Huron in football, too, I can remember when every once in a while, we would even get to thinking we could even beat Aberdeen and Watertown and Huron all in the same season. I won't say that we had the stuff to do it, but we sure had the idea that we could do it. And we tried. We sometimes won, occasionally lost. But whatever it was, it was well done, one way or another.

I have our son Hubert, "Skipper," here today, and his wife Nancy, our son Robert. I have our son-in-law, Bruce Solomonson, sitting here with us, today. Our daughter, Nancy, had to stay back with her two little children, and our son Doug is going back to school—that is a precinct worker for the Democratic Party out there. By golly, I am glad he has a little punch left in him. We need him.

I was just going to mention that my son Doug was home with his ponies, and I guess he got that donkey out there, that young Democrat, a little excited.

I hope that Bob and Skip will really look this town over now so that they can understand what Dad has been talking about all these years.

Well, now, let me just improve my talks with you today. Mike, my good friend, Mike Twiss, my father's friend, my mother's friend, I want to thank you very much for that beautiful, beautiful plaque. Those two miniature pheasants. By the way, I wanted good men of the news media to notice that before I went to high school in the morning back here in the 1920's, I would go out and get my limit of pheasants before breakfast. That is a fact.

How many pheasants can we shoot each year now, Walter? Just two, legally?

I knew. I just thought of that.

How well I remember.

Just a few serious words about things to come. Since leaving Doland, I went to Huron, a wonderful city, just 40 miles south of here. Then I went on to Minneapolis, and the people of Minneapolis have been very good to us, you know that. I simply can't tell you how much I owe to people. Everything I have or everything I hope to be is due to the confidence and trust and friendship of many people.

## 55—RAC—L

I notice many of you have been to Minneapolis. It is a beautiful city. It is one of the most lovely cities in all America. I had the honor of being mayor of that city for two terms. I hadn't lived there very long, as a matter of fact, before I was elected mayor. I had actually lived there less than 8 years and was made the mayor of that great city.

In 1948, I went to Washington as a U.S. Senator and we lived longer in one house in Washington than any other one place in my life. It is a lovely house, just like the one I grew up in here in Doland. I don't know if any of you have seen the film that was done on Doland. I notice some of you went to a lot of trouble to get the film, but it is called "My Childhood." Young Larry Thompson, who was with us here today—where is young Larry?

Larry, you get up on the platform. If anybody belongs up on the platform, it is you.

He has just as many freckles now as I had then. I used to go right down to Longsberry's Barber Shop right over there. That is the young boy who played my part in "My Childhood." The only difference is, he is a better mannered young boy.

As I said, we have lived in Washington now these years and I have had the privilege, like your man, George McGovern, and my neighbor and my good friend, to be a U.S. Senator. I suppose that when I was a boy, according to what I hear here once in awhile, I had dreams of serving in the Government. I guess I did. In fact, I know I did. It is a great privilege to serve in the Congress and it is a great honor to serve in the U.S. Senate and it is a great opportunity.

I have traveled a great deal since those days. I hadn't done much traveling by the time I was a senior in high school. Young seniors have done much more than I did. But we traveled through our books, through the words of our teachers, through the lectures we heard here, through the words of the minister at the church, and through the friends. Since then, as I grew older and obtained and was able to receive these positions of responsibility and honor, we have traveled to the Soviet Union, to Latin America, to the Scandinavian countries, to North Africa, Egypt. We have traveled all over Europe and many other parts of the world. I come back each time loving this country more and more.

I wonder if we have ever stopped to think for a moment, what is it that is so different about us? Because people look so much alike all over the world. I have seen fine towns like this in every country in Europe. I have gone to the beautiful villages, lovely, quaint villages and big cities. And I have seen the people. I have seen people, audiences, large crowds, inside Russia. I have seen the unbelievable poverty and the slums of some of the cities of Latin America. But wherever I have gone, I have found one thing that may never quite measure up to what we have here. I think that what we do is to take it all for granted. We just sort of assume that it is supposed to be this way, until you see how other people have it or don't have it. We have a tremendous system here of government, of enterprise, of social organization. We have a great Constitution that was designed by men of vision and foresight. And we have a capacity for self-government in America that no other people have ever quite developed.

This is such a big country. It is not like England, a wonderful country, but small as the State of Minnesota. We have learned how to govern ourselves, making our mistakes but learning from them. But one other thing that I think we have learned is that if you are going to have a country that is—that offers a future to each generation, you have to keep open the doors of opportunity.

When I saw Doland High School today, I said, this is the key to opportunity, because there is no opportunity for the ignorant. There isn't any opportunity for the illiterate, and there isn't any opportunity for the uneducated. People who are uneducated nowadays, people who have not been privileged to experience learning, they are prisoners. They are like slaves. So, education, in a free society, where you have freedom of choice, where you have opportunity to make choices, where you have opportunity to prove yourself, where you have the opportunity to enrich yourself through enlightenment, education is the secret to power, to freedom, to the good life.

## 56—RAC—L

And one of the things that I am so proud of about Doland is that the people of this community and this district have taken care of that school and you have turned out, year in and year out, dozens of students that have gone on to make a name for themselves, to build good homes, to construct businesses, to do big things for yourself and themselves and their country. And as long as communities like Doland love their schools and love their churches and love their homes and families, there isn't a thing that is going to go wrong with the United States of America. Just remember that.

Now, let me say that this system includes something else. It includes respect for one another. The only aristocracy that we have in America is the aristocracy of achievement and merit, not because of your color, not because of your creed, not because of your place of birth, but because of you. And one of the commitments of my life has been to help eradicate in America these false barriers, these false standards of discrimination, of bigotry and of intolerance that have denied so many people a chance to give of themselves to their country.

We Americans need everybody helping out. We Americans need to set the example of community peace, community tranquility, community order, law and order. We Americans need in our own community to demonstrate the love of one another, the true meaning of brotherhood, applied, not talked about, applied. We need to set an example in America of how we can reconcile our differences and still be different; of how we can have unity without unanimity, of how we can disagree without being disagreeable to one another, and of how we can bind ourselves together in common purpose for great national and international objectives.

The truth is that we are entering upon a new epoch and I envy the young here today. Because what a world they are going to live in unless the adults are foolish enough and mad enough to destroy it. We have within our hands today the power of destruction or the power of salvation. We have in our own hands the power of a whole new world, a better world for everybody, or a world in ashes contaminated by a radioactive debris. Never before has a people been called upon for such self-discipline, and I want to repeat it—never before has a people been called upon for such self-discipline, to control our passions, to control our emotions, and to be resolute in purpose, tolerant of one another and understanding. If we can do this in America, then we have the right to say to the rest of the world "follow us." But if we can't do it, then no one is going to follow us and follow our lead.

So, possibly, on Main Street in Doland, it is the best place to talk about the building a community, not just the community of Doland or of Spink County or of South Dakota or of the United States, but the community of freemen throughout the world.

Freedom is not license, freedom is not lawlessness, freedom is not anarchy. Freedom is responsibility with respect for the rights of others. Freedom is opportunity put to work by a new generation in our time and in time to come. Freedom is what this Nation stands for and lives for, and you don't defend it in Washington alone. You defend it here by what you do, what you believe, what you say and how you live.

Now, that is my message for the day and I am delighted that you have been such a patient audience to listen to an old high school graduate of Doland sort of philosophize with you, giving of himself his innermost thoughts.

May I say now in all seriousness, God bless you.

Thank you.

Huron, S. Dak.  
September 11, 1964

### REMARKS BY SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY

This has been a great day for me. Traveling from Watertown, through Doland, and here to Huron, renewing acquaintances with thousands of old friends in my native State; mixing at first hand again with the sturdy midwestern people who have always provided so much to the moral fiber of our Nation.

Yes, it has been a truly thrilling experience for a boy born in Wallace, back now as a man to ask your confidence and trust as a candidate for Vice President of the United States.

## 57—RAC—L

The experience has been both inspiring and humbling. I accepted the nomination as President Johnson's running mate deeply conscious of the heavy responsibility and obligation it imposes to serve all the people of this Nation to the very best of my ability. In Watertown earlier today, I emphasized my hope that this campaign could become an opportunity to make the entire Nation more aware of the vital contribution rural America makes to our entire national economy.

To our posture for peace and freedom in the world; and  
To the health and well being of all the American people.

South Dakota is a great agricultural State. The success or failure of its main street business enterprises rests largely upon the rise and fall of farm income. I am, however, tired—as I suspect you are—of most commentators talking or writing about the farm problem.

Rather than a problem, agriculture is America's No. 1 economic success story.

American agriculture is the greatest manmade miracle of history. Fewer than 8 percent of the people in America produce enough food and fiber to feed and clothe all the rest. We give away to our needy at home nearly \$1 billion of food each year, distribute some \$2 billion worth around the world under our food-for-peace program, sell for dollars \$4.6 billion worth of food to reduce our balance-of-payments deficit—and still have an estimated unused capacity of 25 percent. We should be proud of this success story, not ashamed of it. Our farm abundance is one of America's greatest assets.

Most people would agree that America's farmers deserve the Nation's thanks, not a kick in the pants, for this amazing success story; *but not Barry Goldwater*. He would take away—if you let him—the limited protection your Government now provides for the producers who have made this modern miracle possible. Today no other nation provides so abundantly for its food needs at so small a relative cost as the United States. Most people of the world are required to spend half their disposable income for food, while we spend less than a fifth of ours. Our incomes have gone up more than the price of food. Greater buying power enables us to take advantage of the abundance of food, including the animal products, provided by an efficient, modern agriculture.

The farmer's share of our food dollar in 1963 was 37 cents. It was 40 cents in 1940, and 53 cents in the war year 1945.

Perhaps these facts will convince most consumers that the amazing American farmers are still their best friends—but, apparently, *not Barry Goldwater*. He still sees no national interest in our Government extending a helping hand to the farm families who guarantee American consumers such food bargains.

The story of rural America's abundant production stands today as our most dramatic example of the success of our traditional free enterprise farmer-owned family farm system as compared to Soviet collectivism. People in the world's newly emerging nations, who know hunger as a daily companion, are confronted with two systems: One is called democracy, the other communism. But only one system has produced the miracle of agricultural abundance. When the Soviet Union came to the West to buy surplus wheat, we scored one of our most impressive propaganda victories in the cold war. Agriculture has indeed provided a dramatic comparison between the forces of freedom and the slavery of Soviet agricultural collectivism.

Most Americans are grateful to American agriculture for proving to the world what freemen in a free society can achieve, *but not Barry Goldwater*. But if the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party doesn't understand the power of food in the cold war, Secretary of State Dean Rusk does. In a speech earlier this year before a great farm gathering in St. Paul, Secretary Rusk said, in part:

The abundance of food and fiber that you produce is a powerful element in our national strength. It is a powerful asset in the defense of our national interests and national life, and in promoting peace and freedom throughout the world.



## 58—RAC—L

The proof to Secretary Rusk's assertion about the power of America's abundance to promote peace and freedom is best illustrated in the overwhelming success of our great food-for-peace program, a program which your distinguished Senator George McGovern had the honor of developing and directing at the beginning of this administration. History will record our food-for-peace undertaking as one of the great humanitarian efforts of all times. It is a product of American compassion, an effective instrument of practical diplomacy which strengthens free nations and underdeveloped areas, and it is also an important instrument of foreign trade. Food for peace is helping to build free nations by generating local capital for economic development. Food for peace is improving child nutrition and education to a remarkable degree through an expanding school lunch program around the world. And food for peace is also good business: It is building new markets and new world trade by creating new appetites and a new ability to buy.

Thanks to the achievements of American agriculture, we have the ability to do something about the world's hunger gap—if we have the vision and courage to do it. Bread, not bullets, may yet prove the real answer to mankind's problems of survival.

Tonight I have emphasized the success story of American agriculture, and the meaning of our abundant production to our Nation—to our consumers, to our businessmen, and to our hopes for peace and freedom in the world. It is a story all rural America knows, yet a story that needs to be retold until all America knows and understands.

But how do we reward the farmers who wrote this success story? The farmer very properly may wonder why his city brother takes his food abundance for granted. He may wonder why success is rewarded with an income that averages only 60 percent of the income received by the nonfarmer.

Our farm people are patient, though long-suffering. They ask no special privilege. They ask only equality of economic opportunity for rural America—for themselves, for their nonfarm neighbors, and for their children.

The goal of President Johnson and the Democratic Party is parity of opportunity for rural America.

This includes:

- Eliminating the gap between income for the farm family and the nonfarm family.

- Providing job and income opportunities in rural America as attractive as those in the cities and suburbs.

- Creating outstanding educational and technical training opportunities for young people in rural areas.

- Establishing public services and facilities in rural America equal to those elsewhere.

The farm family is the principal element in the economic and social structure of rural America—this has been true in the past and it will be true in the future.

But the majority of people in rural America today do not make their living on farms. Thus the progress of farm families and non-farm families in rural America is closely interrelated.

The Democratic Party is deeply concerned with the incomes of those who grow wheat, corn, cotton, and other crops, or raise livestock or dairy cattle.

The Democratic Party is equally concerned, however, with the progress of nonfarm families in rural communities—with educational opportunities, with modern community facilities and services, and, most of all, with jobs.

To these goals we are firmly dedicated. With your help we can make them a reality.

But to achieve these goals, rural America needs President Lyndon B. Johnson—and not Barry Goldwater!

## 59—RAC—L

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, Senator McGovern. Thank you, my good neighbor and my good friend for an introduction that is overly generous, but one that is deeply appreciated.

All I can say to the people of South Dakota is you are so very, very fortunate to have a man of this integrity, of this quality, and of this ability to represent you in the greatest deliberative body of the world, the U.S. Senate, your own Senator George McGovern.

George, I am so pleased that it was possible for you and Eleanor to join us on this trip. We have had a wonderful day together.

In fact, my friends and neighbors of Huron, S. Dak., I haven't seen quite so much of the McGovern family for weeks as I have seen today, even though we are next door neighbors. But we are very busy people, but this has been a rare pleasure.

But I am pleased, too, that on leaving Washington this morning, I could stop at Minneapolis and there pick up the better half of the Humphrey family and have Muriel join us for her trip back to her hometown, because it was in Huron that Muriel Humphrey was born and it was in Huron that Hubert Humphrey found Muriel Humphrey.

Mayor Dunison, I want to thank you so much for your kind words of welcome and reception. I want to thank every one of the many fine groups and citizens in this community for this outpouring of affection and of welcome. I know that in this audience tonight are people of different political persuasions. I know that we have been honored tonight by the great veterans organizations, by our churches. We have been honored tonight by the chamber of commerce of this city and of neighboring cities, even of our largest city of the State, Sioux Falls. We have been honored tonight by young people from all over the State, by farmers and workers and businessmen, by doctors and lawyers and people of every profession. And this sort of outpouring, of friendliness, of neighborliness, and of welcome touches my heart to a point where I scarcely know how to adequately thank you.

May I just say quite humbly and sincerely, thank you, thank you, thank you for what you have done.

I know that the members of our family tonight wish that our dad could be here and that our mother could be here, and I know that Muriel and I and others wish that Andy Butler could be here. What a great family reunion that would be. But I have a feeling that we are all here together, because this is an unusual day. It has been a day so filled with love, so filled with attention, so filled with the kindness of friends that it is beyond my capacity. I can hardly contain myself. And I do want the people in Doland, the people in Watertown, the people from all over the State whom I have seen today, with whom I have shaken hands and exchanged friendly words, I want you to know how happy you have made us.

And I want this band of Doland, S. Dak., to know that I appreciate their coming here tonight and being with us once again. They play good and they play loud. That is like Democrats.

It is a long way from Wallace, S. Dak., to a nomination by a major political party for the office of Vice President. It was just 53 years ago on a day in May that I came to this earthly existence in that little town of Wallace, and many of my days, indeed my early years, those formative years, were spent right here on the great plains of South Dakota. Those were wonderful days, days of character molding, days of forming attitudes, opinions, philosophy. And I think I am a very fortunate man. I have been able to live through the days of South Dakota's travail and heartache and to live in the days of South Dakota's happiness and prosperity.

I think I am a very fortunate man to have been born in the 20th century at a time when a whole new world was opening up to anyone who would see it.

I know that I am very, very fortunate to have such a fine family, such a wonderful wife, and so many good friends. So I feel very prepared, very well prepared as much as one can be with my limited capacities for the challenge I have had and for the opportunities that might lie in the future. Because I am going to talk to you tonight about problems and difficulties and worries and concerns. I am going

## 60—RAC—L

to talk to you about the hopes and the aspirations of America. I am going to talk to you about our opportunities and our challenges, and I am going to talk to you about a better America. Because I have been hearing too many voices that tell us of evil days and evil doing. I have been hearing too often the voices of those that tell us that Americans are unkind to one another, lawless, riotous, licentious. I have been hearing far too often that there is conflict and division between Federal and State government, between State and local government, Mr. Mayor, between worker and farmer, between city and rural area. I have been hearing too often, over the airwaves and viewing on the television and hearing from the public platform that America is sick, that our prosperity is a fake, and that we are losing the cold war and that the Communists are winning. I say to you it is a lie. America is not sick; it is strong.

We are not losing the cold war; we are winning it. Freedom is on the march; communism is in retreat and every decent American knows it to be a fact and we ought to cheer it.

Mr. Mayor of this great city, an enterprising city and one you have a right to be justly proud of, the Federal Government is not your enemy. It has no tyranny and it practices none. The Federal Government is represented on this platform tonight by two U.S. Senators from the people, elected by the people, controlled by the people, by their votes, subject to recall by the people. Those Senators have taken an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States, the greatest political document ever struck off by the hands of man at any one time in the history of the world. I, for one, resent the attack that is made, by spokesmen whoever they may be, that tell us that tyranny reigns in Washington, that our streets are unsafe, that the Federal Government is your enemy and that somehow or another there is a clandestine fraternal war going on between the States and Washington, between the cities and States and farms. It is wrong, my friends. It breeds discontent rather than content, it breeds dissension, it divides the Nation at a time when America needs to be a brotherhood and needs to be undivided as never before in its history.

I shall continue this message wherever I go, because I believe that the time is at hand for America to have advocates, not merely critics. I think the time is at hand for Americans to think positively, not negatively. I think the time is long overdue for Americans to look ahead and not back. I think the time is at hand for adults to plan for a better future for the youth rather than complain about them. And this Senator is going to act that way.

I really believe that America is beautiful. I truly believe that this is the home of the brave. I believe that this is the land of the free. And I believe that this America is literally the greatest opportunity that the world has ever known for anyone who wants to enjoy an opportunity and the privilege of an opportunity.

I know that in America, everyone makes a contribution to our country. I know, for example, that the immigrant that came to this land only a few years ago—yea, less than a year ago—is helping to build a better America. I know that my mother, an immigrant, helped make a better America. And I know that any spokesman for a political party that talks about immigration and immigrants as if it were an evil and they were some sort of a foreign foe, does a disservice to a vast number of Americans who came to America from other lands.

And I also know, my friends, that if America is to lead one people, united, we, the people of the United States of America, if we are to be one people, then we must be in fact and not merely in theory. We must have no second-class citizenship. There can only be one kind of an American, just an American citizen under the Constitution, constitutional guarantees, equal opportunity, equal rights under the law. And any form of second-class citizenship, any form of discrimination, is a denial of the very promise of this land. In fact, it is the denial of the birthright of every American. I believe in full and equal opportunity for all.

And that means not only for the city dweller but also for the rural dweller, not only for the young but for the old. I believe in an America where there is opportunity for our young, where there is compassion for our afflicted, and where there is dignified treatment for

## 61—RAC—L

our elderly. And I do not believe, my fellow Americans, that those who show compassion for the afflicted are weak, and I don't believe that those who show concern for the unfortunate are Socialists. I believe they are good people.

Now, let me say a word or two about one area of our life that all too often gets too little attention in too many places. Earlier today, in Watertown, I spoke of agriculture, and I emphasized my hope that in this campaign, we could make it an educational experience as well as just an oratorical exercise. I want to see this campaign give us an opportunity to make the entire Nation understand the contributions of every segment of this country. I want Americans to understand the contribution of agriculture, just as I want farm people to understand the contributions of our great cities. I want us to learn not only to know each other but to know how to live together in respect and in affection.

I want to have America become aware of the vital contribution that rural America makes to our national economy, to our posture of peace and freedom in the world, and to the health and to the well-being of the American people.

Now, South Dakota is above all an agricultural State. It has many other assets. But agriculture, the land, and the people are the great resources of this State. And the success or failure of any business, whether it be a department store or whether it be Humphrey's drugstore, or a filling station, the success of that business in this State depends upon farm income and what happens if we are not getting on well.

I was once asked who was my greatest teacher, or which, of all the teachers I had, which of the teachers did I think was the better, and I answered, "My father," because I learned from him as a merchant that the prosperity of every businessman on main street, what was in that cash register depended entirely upon the earning capacity of the customers who came through that door. And in this State, as in Minnesota, as all up and down this great Midwest, the largest enterprise in this State is agricultural production and I am for it.

I do not speak of agriculture as a problem. I don't think farmers are problems at all. Sometimes those of us in public office are, but not farmers. I am going to speak of agriculture as America's No. 1 success story and let this story go out through the world.

I have been told in many places that it doesn't make much news nor does it seem to be very dramatic to say that agriculture is the greatest manmade miracle of modern history.

Well, it may not make headlines, but it is a fact. There isn't anything in the world to compare with the miracle of American agricultural efficiency and production. No place can they claim such an achievement.

I have heard of the efficiency of some of our giant corporations, and they are efficient and they make a great contribution to America. But in terms of per capita output, the American farmer has outstripped American industry so that it isn't even a close race. Fewer than 8 percent of the people in American produce enough food and fiber for all of America—actually more than we need—and indeed, produce more than we seem to be able to properly distribute. We give away to our needy at home nearly \$1 million worth of food every year so that no American will ever have to go to bed hungry.

What a wonderful thing that is. Oh, I have heard that this is what they call welfarism, but let me say that the religion that is mine taught me that it is right and proper to share and a government of the people, by the people, and for the people should have the same standards as the people. And if it is good enough for a neighbor to share from his table, then it is good enough for a government to share from its wealth.

We distribute overseas nearly \$2 billion worth of food every year. We sell over \$4½ billion, about \$4.6 billion of food in foreign trade to reduce our balance-of-payments deficits. In fact, American agricultural exports are the largest single item of exports in our total foreign trade. And we still have in America an unused agricultural capacity of over 25 percent.



## 62—RAC—L

I hear people worry about the growth of our population. There is plenty of room in America, my fellow Americans, for more good people and there is plenty of food to feed God's children, worry not about that.

And we should be proud of this success story, not ashamed of it. Because our farm abundance is one of America's greatest assets.

Now, most people would agree, yes, they would agree that American farmers deserve the Nation's thanks, not a kick in the pants for this amazing success story. But I must respectfully and regretfully report tonight that Senator Goldwater doesn't agree. He would take it away, he has said so, if you will let him. He would take away the limited protection your Government now provides for the producers of food and fiber who have made this modern miracle possible, and I don't intend to let him take it away if I can help it.

Today, no other nation provides so abundantly for its food needs at so small a relative cost as the United States. Most people of the world are required to spend up to half of their disposable income, so much more, for basic food essentials. And in the United States of America, you can get all you need to eat and then some of the finest nutritional value for less than a fifth of your disposable income. Food is the best bargain in the world in the United States of America. The farmers share of that food dollar is something to note. Our incomes have gone up. In fact, our family income has gone up \$1,200 per family since 1961. Our incomes have gone up and food prices have remained relatively stable. The farmers' share of that food dollar, my city friend, my consumer friend, in 1963 was 37 cents; in 1940, it was 40 cents; in the war years, it was 45 cents. So don't let me ever hear a political candidate or anyone else say that the American farmer is being treated too generously or is a victim of special privilege. He is not.

Now, perhaps, these facts that I have cited will convince most of the consumers that American farmers are still their best friends. But apparently, the spokesman for the opposition, Senator Goldwater, doesn't agree with me. He still sees no national interest, as he put it, in our Government extending a helping hand to farm families who can guarantee American consumers such an abundance of food at such reasonable prices. It is any wonder that he reported himself quite accurately when he said he knows nothing about farming?

I agree.

I might add, however, that while he would take away our price supports for South Dakota wheat, he doesn't mind advocating in the Congress of the United States a \$1 billion irrigation program for his State.

For this, I wish to commend him. I agree with him; it is needed, just exactly as harnessing the Missouri River in South Dakota and North Dakota is needed for this great Midwest, and he never once ever gave you a vote to help you with that project.

Now, the story of rural America's abundant production stands today as the most dramatic example of the success of our free enterprise, private owner, farmer-owned, family farm system as compared to Communist collectivism. And the people in the world's newly emerging nations who are watching these two systems of capitalism and communism, the people who know hunger as their daily companion, are confronted by these two systems and they are making choices. One system we call democracy, the other communism. But they now see that only one system has been able to produce the miracle of an abundance of food for the people.

When the Soviet Union came to the West, to Canada, and to the United States to buy wheat, a matter which has been criticized in many quarters, we in America scored one of the most impressive propaganda victories of the cold war. We not only scored a great victory, we made them pay for it. We sold over 65 million bushels of wheat, we received over \$140 million in cash and gold and the Soviet Union had to go before the world and confess that its system was a failure.

What more victory do you want?

Indeed, American agriculture has provided a dramatic example of the difference between our systems. Now, most Americans are very grateful to American agriculture for proving to the whole world what freemen, free enterprise, in a free society can achieve. But not Senator Goldwater.

## 63—RAC—L

If the temporary spokesman of his party doesn't understand the power of food in the cold war, thank goodness, some important public officials do. The Secretary of State, for example, Mr. Rusk, does. In a speech earlier this year before a great farm gathering in St. Paul, Secretary Rusk said this: "The abundance of food and fiber that you produce is a powerful element in our national strength. It is a powerful asset in the defense of our national interests and national life, and in promoting peace and freedom throughout the world."

This Georgia farm boy, and Dean Rusk was born on a farm in Georgia, reared on a farm in Georgia, this great distinguished scholar, this able, distinguished Secretary of State, respected throughout the world, he understands the importance of food, an abundance of food and fiber in this great struggle that takes place in the world. It would seem to me that a spokesman for a major political party would at least understand that fact of our national life.

Now, the importance of food to our security and freedom is best illustrated in the overwhelming success story of the food-for-peace program, a program we referred to earlier this evening, yes, one in which I did have a hand—I am proud of it—but a program which your own distinguished U.S. Senator, George McGovern, had the honor of developing and expanding and directing at the beginning of the Kennedy-Johnson administration. And the name of George McGovern is known throughout the world as a name that saved lives, that helped the unfortunate, that fed the hungry, and helped the sick. What greater honor could a man want in his lifetime than to know that he had saved the life of some person somewhere in this great world of ours.

History will record our food-for-peace undertaking as one of the truly great humanitarian efforts of all times. It is a product of American compassion—a compassion that has been taught to us in our churches in our fraternal orders, in our homes. Thank God for America's soft heart. Thank God for America's compassion. Don't be ashamed of it; be proud of it.

The food-for-peace program has been an effective instrument of practical American diplomacy which has strengthened free nations and helped underdeveloped areas and it has been an important instrument in the development of foreign trade. American agricultural exports are flourishing. Our commerce is expanding. Why? Because we were willing to share of our abundance and because we did cast our bread upon the water, it has come back a thousandfold in commerce and trade and goodwill throughout all the earth.

Food-for-peace is helping to build free nations, generating local capital, building local economies. Food-for-peace is improving child nutrition, training doctors, permitting roads to be built, paying for work in countries and places far away. And it has provided, my dear friends, for the daily feeding of 100 million children in school lunch programs, children who never would have tasted the fruit of the earth that is a gift not only of man but of Divine Providence. I am proud of my Government. I am proud of a government that does this for a needy and hungry humanity. Aren't you?

Food-for-peace is, as I said, also a good business. It is building those new markets, new world trade, by creating new appetites and new ability to buy. So thanks to the achievements of our farm families, we have the ability to do something about the world hunger gap. And the hunger gap is more dangerous, my friends, than any weapons gap. And that hunger gap we have been able to help fill.

When it comes to weapons and military power, there is no combination of nations now or in the foreseeable future that will ever be able to equal the power that the United States of America has available at this very hour that I speak to you. Bread, not bullets, may yet prove the real answer to mankind's problem of surviving. And bread we have, and bullets, too. We have demonstrated to the world for friend and foe alike to see that we can have both butter and guns. We can have the strength that is necessary to put us in the position to bargain and to negotiate with order, and we have the material substance that can sustain us over the long period of our trials and of our tribulations.

## 64—RAC—L

Oh, I am not one that is losing confidence in America. I don't think we are soft. I don't think we are losing. I don't think we are being outmaneuvered. I think we have within our hands every instrument that is needed to build a better world if we but have the will to use those instruments for the good of mankind.

So tonight I have told you what I believe to be the essential part of the great success of America, American agriculture, the meaning of the abundant farm production to our Nation, to our consumers, to our businessmen, to our hopes for freedom, and peace in the world. It is a story that all America needs and it is a story that needs to be retold in every hall, over every radio and television, in every school and every club until Americans appreciate what the tillers of the soil have done and are doing and until we understand and appreciate the meaning of food and fiber in a hungry and sick world.

But how do we reward our farmers for this store? The farmer may very properly wonder why his city brother takes this food and this achievement for granted. He may wonder why his success is rewarded with an income that averages only 60 percent of the income received by the nonfarmer.

Our farm people are patient, though long-suffering. They ask no special privilege. They ask only equality of economic opportunity for rural America, for themselves, for their nonfarm neighbors, and for their children. And I say to this audience tonight the goal of President Lyndon Johnson, the man with whom I am privileged to run on this great Democratic ticket, the role of President Johnson and the Democratic Party is parity of opportunity for rural America and it is to that goal that we are working.

And what does this mean? It means eliminating the gap between the income of the farm family and the nonfarm family.

It means providing job and income opportunities in rural America as attractive as those in our cities and our suburbs.

It means creating outstanding educational and technical training opportunities for young people in rural America.

The only way that I know that we are going to be able to maintain young people on our farms and in rural America is to make rural America such a wonderful place in which to live that people will want to stay there so that they can live the good life.

The progress of farm families and nonfarm families in rural America is as one, interrelated. Yes, my fellow Americans, the Democratic Party is deeply concerned about the incomes of those who grow wheat, corn, cotton, and other crops or raise livestock or dairy cattle. And that concern has been expressed in legislation. It has been expressed in administrative policy. It has been expressed in action, in REA and Farmers Home Administration, Soil Conservation, in price supports and crop controls and school lunches, in special milk programs—in a host of programs.

The Democratic Party is equally concerned with the progress of nonfarm families in all communities. That has been expressed in educational opportunities, in aid to education, modern community facilities, housing, the rebuilding of our cities, the building of our roads and transportation. Because if there is any one lesson that we know tonight, in this year 1964, it is that we are our brother's keeper, it is that we are one family and it is that we are interdependent.

There is no such thing as a United States of America part of the rich and part of the poor. There is no such thing as a united America, part of the behind and part of the ahead. What we need to do is not to pull down those who are on top, but to help those who are coming up.

Our ambition and our commitment should be, as I said in the beginning of these remarks, opening the pathways of opportunity, giving people the tools to do the job to make a better life, having a better America.

When our President was asked early in his administration: "Mr. President," said this TV commentator—"Franklin Roosevelt had his New Deal, Harry Truman had his Fair Deal and the late beloved President John Kennedy had his New Frontier. How would you describe or term your administration?"

## 65—RAC—L

And quietly, thoughtfully, President Lyndon Johnson responded to the commentator. He said, "What this administration seeks is a better deal for all Americans, a better deal for the world, a better deal in terms of better living, a better education, a better health, a better public facilities, a better security, a better diplomacy, and a better chance for peace. To achieve these goals, it is my considered judgment and it has been for a long time that America needs leadership that looks to the future. America needs a President who has the courage to wage war on poverty and not one that wages war on progress."

And I don't think I need to say more. It adds up to but one conclusion and that decision is in your hands, the voters. On that eventual and fateful day of November 3, 1964, I would say to you that America needs President Lyndon B. Johnson in the White House for 4 more years.

Rapid City, S. Dak.  
Rapid City Airport  
September 12, 1964

### REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, Congressman Brown. You might just as well get used to saying that.

Bud, it is a joy to be here in your West River country. Mayor Schroeder, I am very honored by your reception, your hospitality and your cordial welcome. I want to thank you and the people of Rapid City for this generous, hospitable welcome to our party.

I have been having such a good time with our neighbor and friend, your U.S. Senator, George McGovern. We have been together more in the past couple of days than we have for I don't know how long. We are both so busy in Washington, he with his work and Hubert Humphrey with his work, that we seldom get a chance to be good neighbors.

I want to tell you that the McGoverns live right next door to the Humphreys. While George and Hubert may not always have as much time to visit together as much as they would like, Eleanor and Muriel are doing just fine.

Now, having mentioned my Muriel, I want to apologize for her not being able to be with you today. She left us this morning in Huron, because she is not only my wife and the wife of a candidate, but she is also a mother and our 16-year-old son is returning to school tomorrow and somebody has to be around to sort of make sure that at least he gets a good start. What happens from there on out, that is up to him.

Public life isn't the easiest sort of life on families. So we have made up our mind that somebody has to have good sense in the family when it comes to family life, at least, and that is Mrs. Humphrey. So she is there with our son.

I want to thank the welcoming committee, and the ladies that were here with their flowers. I will tell Mrs. Humphrey of your thoughtfulness and of your kindness.

To Homer Kandaris, my regards and thanks for all that you are doing in behalf of Bud Brown.

To a fellow Minnesotan that found his way out here to this beautiful part of America, to Nate Horowitz, as much as I would like to have you back in Duluth, Nate, stay right here in Rapid City and help folks out around here.

You know, Mr. Mayor, I think you are a very lucky man to be the mayor of a great city here at the foot of the Black Hills. I have been in this part of America many times. I can remember my first trip out here. I remember it as a boy. I traveled out here in an old model T sedan. I can remember having all the camping equipment on the running board.

Whatever happened to the running board?

I can remember that we parked that car out in one of the parks here and put up our tent and I can remember it rained all morning. I guess it was the only rain we had that year, but it all came out at once. I can remember and recall so well being in the Black Hills. I think the Black Hills is one of the most beautiful, beautiful areas of all the world, and I have seen a lot of this world. It is just beautiful.



## 66—RAC—L

They tell me that it has more mineral deposits, more resources in 100 square miles of it than any other place in the world.

I don't know too much about geology, but I sure do know that it is pretty. And I surely know that Harney's Peak is the highest peak from the east coast to the Rockies.

Isn't that right?

When I was a native South Dakotan, I bragged about that a good deal. By the way, I still do.

Mr. Mayor, you have some other things out here that I would like to comment on a moment. I want to say to you, Bud, when you get to represent this district, which will be right after that election on November 3, you are here representing for all practical purposes the great way to the West. The West is a part of America that is young; it is vital. It is filled with promise and filled with hope and every day, filled with more achievement.

If there ever was a slogan for a political party or administration that applied to this part of the country, it was the one that John Kennedy gave to his administration, the New Frontier. Because this is the New Frontier.

When I think how Rapid City has grown in these years, when I think of the tremendous development here, when I think of what has happened, for example, in the Missouri River—we flew over the Oahe Dam this morning. What a magnificent reservoir, what potentialities, what possibilities for industrial growth and expansion here in this part of America.

I hope that isn't one of Barry's boys going by there.

But in all honesty, you really do live on the approaches of a great new era and a great new era of human history and human development. I want to commend you. I think you are lucky, real lucky.

Not long ago, I was in Salt Lake City, not too far from here by plane. There, again, I saw the very thing that I witness here, a new vitality, a sense of looking out across the countryside lifting one's eyes as you see the mountains. Because people who live in hill country or mountain country always have to look up unless you stumble.

And people that are looking up or looking ahead ought to vote for Lyndon B. Johnson in this next election.

Mr. Mayor, you made some reference to even driving a bit fast. I can't imagine to whom he was referring. But then on second thought, I can. I really think America has a choice in this election. You have a choice of whether or not you want a man with his foot on the throttle or his foot on the brake.

I would rather have a man who drives a little fast than a man who has his foot on the brake half the time and has his car in reverse the other half.

So ride along with Johnson and Humphrey, my folks, and we are going places.

Not far from here is one of the great defense installations of America. Again, you realize, once again, if you pause for just a moment, how important you are, how important this part of America is, the Ellsworth Air Force Base, a part of our great Strategic Air Command, the most powerful striking force for freedom and peace that the world has ever known.

And don't you ever let anybody tell you that this country is weak and don't you believe those prophets of despair and division. This country is powerful and it is strong. Within a few miles of here is one of the mighty missile complexes, better than 100 Minutemen—Minuteman, the finest missile ever perfected by the genius of man. How many, George? Nine squadrons of antimissiles. And we are only beginning in our development of national strength.

All of this is for one purpose—not for attack, not for aggression, not for power for the sake of power, but for peace and for justice and for freedom. That is what we build them for.

I can see part of my staff getting a little restless, because, you know, I have some remarks here that I want to make other than those I have already made. But I have a weakness. I like people and I like to be with you, I really and truly do.

I like all kinds of people. In fact, I like the man who is on the other ticket. I think he is a pretty fine man; he just has some bad ideas, that is all. I know him as a friend, know him as a colleague, and I hope that, during this campaign, I can always think of him as a friend.

## 67—RAC—L

But I have had some pretty rough arguments with some of my friends. I have even had an argument once in a while now at home. The only difference is I don't intend to lose this argument; I lost some of the others.

But let the record be clear. The gentleman from Arizona is a good citizen, he is a good man. We are on opposite sides of the fence politically.

That is a Democrat—he is hitting on all 12.

Senator Goldwater is a man of many contradictions. For example, he has written books, he writes articles, he makes speeches. I have a little difficulty keeping up with where he stands, because this fellow is a moving target. He shifts on me all the time.

Recently, he has talked of reducing Government expenditures—that is a favorite topic, you know, to the political hustings—while at the same time he is proposing the largest peacetime spending program in the Nation's history. If you will examine the record, you will see how right I am: that is correct, I am not as far right as Goldwater, but I am correct on this one.

Look at these contradictions now. When he had a chance in the Senate, when the vote was there, when there was an opportunity to do something about taxes and tax reduction, he votes against the tax reduction measure in January and February, and by September he proposes one of his own. It is safer that way, because this one he will never have a chance to work on. And on the day after he proposes his own 25-percent tax cut—he does it in a big way—he denounces a carefully thought out, fiscally responsible tax cut that was approved by Congress. He denounced it as, and I quote his own words, “a cynical scheme that was impulsive, that was massive, politically motivated tax cut gimmickry.”

Well, now, I wonder how the National Chamber of Commerce feels about that. They supported that tax cut that he denounced as cynical. Both political parties supported that tax cut. The most prominent businessmen in America, the outstanding economists of America, they supported the tax cut that George McGovern voted for, that Hubert Humphrey voted for, and that Lyndon Johnson signed as a law.

I haven't seen anybody refuse to take it, either, including the Senator.

Now, the lesson of all of this is mighty clear. National budgets and fiscal policy can't and should not be formulated in the chaos of the Republican Convention of the Cow Palace in San Francisco or in the cabin of Senator Goldwater's jet plane. It takes more serious thought than that. I know the American people are waiting anxiously to learn how Senator Goldwater plans to increase spending, reduce revenues by 25 percent, and balance the budget all at the same time. I want to tell you if you can do that you make Houdini look like a piker.

I have a suggestion. If Senator Goldwater would just trade in his ham radio for an adding machine, he would discover to his astonishment that his tax and expenditure commitments would add up to the biggest Federal deficit in peacetime history.

Now, let's just take a look at it. First, where does Senator Goldwater stand on Government spending?

Well, adding up the costs and the promises of the Republican platform for 1964, just in the area of military items, Senator Goldwater is committed to the following expenditures: No. 1, he would develop and procure at a cost of approximately \$10 billion additional a new manned bomber in place of the B-52's. That is where he starts. That is just a little item to get started with.

He would spend at least \$7 billion a year more than is now being spent on military research and development. He proposes an anti-ballistic missile system around our cities at a cost of not less than \$20 billion.

Now, since this system would be of little value without air raid shelters to protect the cities, you would have to add another approximately \$2 billion, according to the Bureau of the Budget, just to make sure we have some place in which to hide.

## 68—RAC—L

He would expand our present \$11½ billion space program. He says it is totally inadequate. He would build another \$400 million aircraft carrier that he has pledged himself to, and he is going to reactivate those military bases which have already been closed as obsolete and unnecessary.

That is quite an order, my taxpayers; quite an order.

Finally, he would urgently spend over \$1 billion for the central Arizona project for his own State—no budget cutting out there, you know, folks.

Now, with this program, at a rockbottom minimum, and believe me, it is a minimum, because actually on the space program alone it runs higher than the figure I am about to talk about, he would increase Federal spending by not less than \$5 billion per year for the next 5 years, and by pure coincidence, this is exactly the amount that the Republican candidate pledged to cut the budget if he got elected President of the United States.

Now, at an early date in this campaign, Senator Goldwater is already \$10 billion behind the line of scrimmage and rapidly losing ground.

But this is only half the story. He has also promised some automated tax reductions—automatically to happen. He promises these despite the fact that he voted against the \$11½ billion tax cut, the largest tax cut in the Nation's history, which gave you \$9½ billion as individuals in tax reductions and \$2 billion to corporations, which was supported by 70 percent of the Republicans and 84 percent of the Democrats. They supported the tax cut, Republicans and Democrats alike, but not Senator Goldwater.

Mr. Goldwater has several items that he proposed. But it all adds up to one thing. There will be a \$5 billion minimum increase in the expenditures the first year and they rapidly increase each year. Added to a first-year cut in Federal tax revenues of around \$8 to \$9 billion that means an increase in the deficit for 1966, fiscal 1966—that is the year in case the worst of all things should happen to us, if Mr. Goldwater were to become the President—that is the year that you would have a deficit of \$13 to \$14 billion. And add to that the present deficit of \$3 billion which might be expected in the absence of a Goldwater program, and there is a total deficit that Mr. Goldwater would have for the American people for 1966 of \$16 billion.

And he says he is fiscally responsible?

I don't want him keeping my books, believe me.

That is a far greater deficit than any previous peacetime record and the previous peacetime record wasn't under a Democrat.

It was in 1959, \$12½ billion, the books were out of balance.

Now, this massive deficit, with an exploding economy as it is now, approaching full employment, would wreck the economy and set off an orgy of inflation. And this is why the big business leaders of America have left Barry Goldwater. This is why you read in the press that the top corporate executives of America are voting for Lyndon Johnson.

Why? Because these men that are responsible for stocks, for your stocks, responsible for your investments, these bankers that are responsible for your deposits, they cannot bear the thought of having a man in the White House who is so fiscally irresponsible as the temporary spokesman of the Goldwater faction of the Republican Party.

And talk about a deficit in the balance of payments, a flight of gold; it would take wings and be gone. Over the next 5 years, according to your own Bureau of the Budget, there would be an accumulative revenue loss of \$90 billion.

You talk about a cynical tax proposal, a disregard for fact and reason.

And, at the same time, Federal spending would be at an alltime high.

Now, my fellow Americans, no matter how thick or thin the Senator slices his fiscal and tax policy, it is still baloney. And don't forget it.

## 69—RAC—L

Now, we are going to leave you and going on to the great western city of Denver. We are going to try to bring a message there of our party. I want to say to you as I leave this platform that 4 years ago, almost, we made some promises to the American people. Our late, beloved President, who never had a chance to live to see all those promises fulfilled, President Kennedy, told us on January 1961, "Let us begin." And I am happy to see the young people here, because of all the people whose lives he touched, it was the young. They loved him. And we did make that beginning.

I knew the President as a personal friend, and I wept unashamedly just as you did when he was taken from us. I know the present President as a personal friend. I have been with him for 16 years—12 years in Congress, and now 4 with him as Vice President and as President. For these almost 4 years, every Tuesday morning I have sat at the breakfast table with the late President John Kennedy and then Vice President Lyndon Johnson and now President Johnson. I have been there with them as I watched these programs develop and as I watched us and saw us perfect the programs to carry out our promises, and I say to this audience with all the sincerity at my command, we did make promises; we made some pledges.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have kept them. You check the record. We have kept them.

I ask you to give President Johnson the opportunity to do what he pledged us he would do on that day of November 27, 1963, 5 days after that shameful day at Dallas. You may remember those words; they were very simple. He said, "Let us continue."

And I ask in particular the young people here to give us a chance to continue the work that was so nobly begun. I ask you to give a vote of confidence to the man in whom President Kennedy put his confidence.

Remember that. Remember that possibly the greatest act of President Kennedy was his selection of his Vice President. And that Vice President is today at the White House, governing this country. He isn't going to have enough time to get out on the political hustings all the time. I am going to have to do that for him. I would say that the greatest privilege that has ever been mine is to have been selected, first recommended by President Johnson as his running mate. He reposed his confidence in me.

And, secondly, my friends, to have been nominated by acclamation by the Democratic Convention. I know that this is a sobering responsibility, I know that it is a heavy one, and I make you this pledge.

I will do everything within my power to be worthy of that responsibility and to be worthy of the honor. I will attempt to conduct myself in this campaign in a manner that will be at least worthy of your respect, and I hope of your vote.

Let's give Lyndon B. Johnson a vote of confidence, let's assure his victory, and Bud Brown his victory on November 3.

Thank you.

Denver, Colo.  
Stapleton Airport  
September 12, 1964

### REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, my good, nonpartisan, pro-Democratic, L.B.J. mayor of Denver.

First of all, Mr. Mayor, I want to express my thanks to this wonderful band that is here to greet us and this color guard. This is very thoughtful of you and it is very impressive and deeply appreciated.

Secondly, I want to salute my colleagues in the Congress of the United States, Congressman Rogers, Congressman Aspinall, and also these new ones we are going to have, Roy McVickers, here, and Frank Evans.

Then I want to pay my respects to a dear old friend, with whom I was privileged to serve and who served with such distinction, your own former Senator and still one of the greatest citizens of the West, Senator Ed Johnson.

There are just so many people here that I could mention that we could spend a whole afternoon out here at the airport just reminiscing. But lest we forget for a moment, let me say I once lived in Denver and I like Denver and I like Colorado and I like the Democrats out here.



## LINO—RAC—70

I also want to mention that a dear friend of mine was here to welcome me when I came in the airplane. I have known him for years, and I miss him in Washington and I am sorry he is not here. That is that old good fighter, the man for progressive democracy, John E. Carroll.

You know, I used to complain about the fact that we needed a new Secretary of Agriculture. That is back in the days of Benson—I shouldn't have mentioned that name. But I was glad to see today a friend of the farmer, a great former Secretary of Agriculture, Charley Brannan, here along with my old friend, Jim Patton, of the Barbers Union.

Then let me say to our friends in the labor movement, Mr. Roth, Harry Roth, and to Mr. Knight, Mr. Brown, and a host of the others, how grateful I am for this reception.

Now, friends, look here. You have done some good work on these signs and I want to congratulate the artists, the artists of the West who made all these signs of L.B.J. and H.H.H. Just keep them high all during this campaign.

And I noticed when I got off the plane that there were a number of people here who came up to me and said "Buena suerte," which means good luck, Hubert. I wish to raise my voice today and salute my good friends here, the Spanish-speaking Americans who are out here to help the Democratic Party go on to victory on November 3.

Well, friends, we are involved now in a big campaign, a campaign that is going to either mean that we continue the program of progress and prosperity which this country presently has, or it can end up in a situation where America literally retreats.

But I was at Rapid City just a few moments ago. The mayor of that city, Mayor Currigan, said that he heard occasionally in Washington that people in Washington were capable of driving rather fast. I guess that was a reference to that man from Texas. And I said then and I want to repeat it here now, I think America has a choice of whether it wants a man in the driver's seat who has his foot on the throttle and the gas feed, or a man who has his foot on the brake and slips the car in reverse. That is your choice.

You know, we also have a unique situation that is developing in America. We have people today who are not just Democrats who are going to vote the Democratic ticket. We have literally thousands, yes, millions of people, who for many years have considered themselves as Republicans. But this time, yes, sir, but this time, that man is going to vote the Democratic ticket for Johnson.

Isn't that so?

Now, you know, my dear friends, most Republicans and most Democrats in Congress, they vote to help the West move ahead with economic progress.

But not Senator Goldwater.

Most Americans, whether they are Democrats or Republicans, voted for equal opportunity for all Americans, regardless of race, color, or creed.

But not Senator Goldwater.

You are with it today, you are with it today, you are doing fine.

Most Americans thought it was a good idea that we have a tax reduction this year and that those taxes that were reduced and the income from those reductions go to the American people so that the American people could spend, so they could invest, so we can have a bigger and better America.

Yes, most Americans—Republicans and Democrats alike—in Congress voted to reduce your taxes. But not Senator Goldwater.

You know the score, all right. You know the score.

Most Americans, my young people, most Senators voted for aid to education, higher education for your colleges. Most Americans did that.

But not Senator Goldwater.

You have the record of no, no, no, a thousand times no, and that kind of record means no go for America, and that means there will be a no vote on November 3 for Senator Goldwater.

Now, my friends, we have some work to do this afternoon. I just want to leave you with this note of caution.

## 71—RAC—L

This is going to be a hard-fought campaign and I want every one of you here to take a pledge with me today. I want you to pledge that you are going to work harder than you have ever worked before so that you can be sure, despite the good polls, despite all of the evidence that we have that we are going to have victory on November 3, I want you to pledge me now, and I want you to raise those signs high, pledge to me, my friends, that between now and November 3, you are going to make sure that Lyndon B. Johnson and Hubert Humphrey are elected in that great election.

Thank you, thank you very much.

---

Denver, Colo.  
Denver Athletic Club  
September 12, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY (QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION), LUNCHEON WITH COLORADO STATE PRESS, DENVER, COLO.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, Palmer. I appreciate this effort at fiction that you have just gone through. I now know why he is such a great publisher and editor, because he can take a fellow like Hubert Humphrey and make him sound like he is something.

Palmer, Mr. Hoyt, I want to thank you from the bottom of my heart for your warm reception, your introduction, and for the honor and privilege of your friendship.

May I just pay my respects here to Mr. Foster, of the Rocky Mountain News, to my colleagues in this worthy endeavor called politics, those that are in now, those that were in, and those that seek to get in. May I say that the best thing is to be in, seeking is second best, and out—I don't have much for that.

You have indicated that "Capital College" closed its doors shortly after I left and there is some truth to that. As a matter of fact, it is a fact. It reminds me, so that you will be prepared, this athletic club, not long ago I spoke at Newell, Minn. We have a place there called Turner Hall. It is a community where the citizens are of German descent and the boys gather at Turner Hall for their sort of fraternal club and have a pretty good time. I was invited down one evening to make a speech. I gave a speech and it was a ripper, just going after them. The headlines next morning read, "Humphrey Gives Hot Speech; Turner Hall Burns."

So you can see, you can never tell what will happen.

Now, Mr. Scher, I understand that you would like this to be conducted as a question-and-answer operation. I think that every taxpayer, every American citizen, is entitled to one bite of a live U.S. Senator. So with that as preface and as sort of an invitation, why don't you take off and let's see what we can do.

Please identify yourself and then just ask the question.

Who is first?

QUESTION. Senator, you hinted some time back that there would be a new look at agriculture. What would that new look disclose that we don't already know about that part of the economy that is so vital to these Western States?

Of course, a corollary question goes with it. What can we hope to get to halt vertical integration, the trend of monopoly, the concentration of economic power, which is what the farm, agriculture, and small business is confronted with?

Nice question, Hu?

Senator HUMPHREY. I was just going to say. I would first want to remind you that I only plan on spending a few hours here today and my time here is rather limited.

The question is rather limited. The question is far reaching, sweeping, and indeed a very meaningful and profound question, because it relates to the developments not only in our agricultural segment of the economy, but the total economy as you have indicated.

What I have said is that much of the agricultural legislation that we presently have was passed and then amended or patched, relating to an agricultural economy which now is considerably different than it was at the time of its passage.

## 72—RAC—L

For example, we have what we call the basics in agriculture—certain commodities that we call the basics, like cotton, wheat, and corn. Actually, there are many other commodities today that are much more basic in terms of income in agriculture than some of these. I think we, therefore, need to sort of get this whole agricultural program out of the immediate conflict of political argument and try to get it one step above it. I have proposed, therefore, that it appears now that a broadly based, well-organized, blue ribbon commission, appointed by the President of the United States, with confirmation by the Members of the Senate, of citizens who are not in public life, in part, and persons who are in public life, to compose this commission. The number could be anywhere from 15 to 25, because I think you need enough members so that you give a broad—have a broad cross section of the Nation.

What would this commission do?

Well, it would study, for example, such questions as these: No. 1, should we have what we call compensatory payments, production payments, as a means of assuring a degree, a fair degree of income, or a degree of fair income, for a farm producer or should we have what are the traditional crop loans and price supports. I happen to be one who believes that we are now entering a period where, because of the social values that are involved in the family farm, in order to keep, however, that family farm productive, you must have an increase in its size in some areas—that it would be better to have what we call compensatory or production payments. I think this gives the free market the better opportunity to operate. It permits the normal practices in the market of the farm cooperative in its merchandising, of the grain trade in its merchandising, of the cotton exchange in its merchandising, rather than have the Commodity Credit Corporation become the largest merchandising entity in the entire agricultural economy.

It is my view that the Commodity Credit Corporation was set up to supplement and not to supplant the normal facilities of the American agricultural distribution. That is one question.

No. 2, I think we ought to find out what is a surplus and what isn't. We go around talking all the time about the great surpluses we have. If we should happen to have an extensive growth throughout the entire Midwest, the breadbasket area, for example, let's say, in wheat, we may have no surplus at all, very well, because much of the wheat in storage is not wheat for milling purposes, much of the wheat is the type of wheat that we call good for feeding purposes, for livestock feed. We need to determine what are our strategic national reserves. How much should we carry as a national reserve for the security of this Nation and then quit talking about the burden of surpluses.

It is my considered judgment as one man's opinion that much of what we presently have in storage is needed in storage just as much as businessmen need an inventory to operate his business and just as much as the Defense Department needs ammunition in supply to operate our Military Establishment.

But we are led to believe throughout the country that the minute you get 100 million bushels of feed grain in storage in Commodity Credit that somehow the farmers have overproduced, that they are just loading the Government down with grain and the taxpayers are paying for it and it is a terrible, terrible mess. The real mess will be when you run short of feed grains with the amount of livestock we have in this country.

The real problem will be when you run short of wheat, how much can we afford to export? There is a great shortage in many parts of the world. We can overexport in various of our commodities and find ourselves in a predicament.

What about farm credit? The Farmers Home Administration has a totally inadequate base for its structure. Would loans cost so much today?

The loans made are designed primarily for a farm operation when a young man or young couple would set up when a \$20,000 farm is the average base in my part of the country. Today that farmer can't get a start for less than \$50,000 or \$60,000. He needs a credit base.

## 73—RAC—L

This is what I mean by taking a new look at agriculture and there are a lot of other things.

About the vertical integration, I think we have to face up to the fact, for example, that some of our farms are going to have to be bigger. This doesn't mean that you need corporate structure in agriculture. I do think we ought to take a good hard look in this business, however, of where you have a retail organization that has vertical integration, goes right down to the feeder lot in cattle, for example, and right on out, actually, to the calves; right on the range. That sort of operation interferes with what has been a basic distribution structure in this country and can literally break prices and cause the cattleman and the cattle producer and the feeder a great deal of trouble. One of the real problems we have today in the cattle industry is right in that particular development.

Enough on that one. Now we will move along.

Mr. SCHER. Who has a hot one?

Senator HUMPHREY. That was pretty good.

QUESTION. I would like to continue that question just a little bit. The administration has largely had its way on import legislation. Would you consider looking at your crystal ball sufficiently to tell us what you think is ahead for the cattlemen in this part of the country, please?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, fortunately, the price of cattle is better right now. It is much higher than it was, let's say, in the month of May. There has been a considerable recovery. There is no doubt but what there was a heavy influx of imports back in 1963, more than was justified. But the facts are also quite revealing, that when those imports came in, it was primarily in a type of meat, as you know, for hamburger and hot dogs and what you have, a type of meat we don't have in too much supply in the United States, because we have developed a higher grade of beef.

The American consumer, the housewife, wants a better cut. In fact, one of our problems today on exports in Europe is that we have developed such a high type of animal product we are having a difficult time finding a good market for the high type of quality of meat we have in the United States.

Well, you know what happened when the price started to break, somewhat due to imports, more to an increase in population of cattle. When that price started to fall, the natural tendency on the part of the cattle raiser, particularly the feeder lots, was to hold those cattle. When you hold them, you add on more poundage. It isn't just the percentage of the population, it is also the tonnage and the poundage. When you took the poundage to the market, you started to break the price, so you held it a little longer so it became a vicious circle.

Then you have the short-term credit, unfortunately. I think we have to get into an intermediate credit structure, not just 1- or 2-year loans, but 4- and 5-year loans, so a man can ride out the storm.

What about the future?

As it looks right now, because of the heavy sales of cattle in Europe, because of the drought in Europe, because of the drought in the Argentine and other problems there, because of the negotiated agreements we have with Australia, New Zealand, and with Mexico, we are in much better shape, there are fewer imports coming in. The imports are lower now than they have been for years and we have a good working relationship with these countries.

One of the reasons the pressure is off is they are shipping a lot into Western Europe. In the meantime, you know the President set up this commission of salesmen, a very competent group of men, sent them to Europe to look for new markets. We have never really explored for export markets for our beef products. Now, at long last, we are beginning to look for those export markets.

But as I recall, and I haven't my notebook on these, and these figures are a bit tricky, I believe the census is up about \$2-million projected for next year.

Isn't that about right, Dave?



## 74—RAC—L

About \$2 million. It is kind of hard to keep up on each of the items, but if that is the case and if the cattle are held too long, we could have—let me see here. The cow herd on January 1, 1964, was 32 million head as compared with only 24 million in 1958, an increase of one-third. This is part of our problem. The number of cattle on feed continued to increase sharply and the number on feed in January 1964 was almost 9 million head or over 30 percent higher than 1958.

It looks now that we are going to have an increase again. The average market weights continued to increase and by the early spring of 1964, were some 70 pounds per animal higher than in 1958.

As a result of larger marketings at heavier weights, beef slaughter in 1963 exceeded that in 1962 by 8 percent. So you see what happened with the increases.

Now, the future? I think it looks fairly good if we can keep down the imports and we have legislation that permits the President—let me put it this way, that gives the President a little more leverage in our negotiations with our other countries, friendly countries. We did not have a sharp cutoff. I think that would have been somewhat dangerous. We knew that and we wanted to give the President the authority to constantly examine the import situation and if he found that the volume of imports was threatening the price structure in America, then he can impose quotas. This gives him that extra leverage that he needs when he bargains with Australia, with New Zealand, with Mexico, with the Argentine, or with any of the other countries.

I would say if you are not expecting a bonanza but expecting a good normal income, the cattle industry looks good for the future.

QUESTION. If that is all true, why doesn't the price at retail come down?

Senator HUMPHREY. That is one of the things we are looking into. That is exactly why we passed the Food Marketing Commission.

QUESTION. Senator, what is your reaction to Senator Goldwater's income tax cut proposals?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I wish Mr. Goldwater had got his fiscal religion about 8 or 9 months earlier. Mr. Goldwater voted against the tax cut that was well thought out, upon which there had been months of hearings, that was the result of the calculations and the thoughtful analysis of dozens of economists and fiscal experts. He called that tax cut that we voted in the early months of 1964, he said it was a cynical business, that it was politically motivated. He made all kinds of charges about it. I notice now that in September, after the Congress had already voted a tax cut of a little over \$11½ billion, which he voted against, Mr. Goldwater has come to the conclusion that we didn't do enough and that he advocates another 25 percent cut in the next 5 years, in a package along with other proposed tax cuts.

I personally believe Mr. Goldwater got his cynical statement on the wrong tax bill. He got a paragraph mixed up in his speech. If there is anything cynical about a proposal of tax reduction, it is the one he has just offered, because at the most conservative estimates, it means an estimated loss in revenue in the next 5 years of \$90 billion.

At the same time he is proposing that, he is proposing fantastic expansions in our defense budget, and it is no small item now.

I analyzed this this morning at Rapid City. I think the facts are something like this. He proposes to substitute a manned bomber for the B-52 which will cost, according to the Department of Defense in its cost analysis, not less than \$10 billion over and above what we are spending. He proposes an antiballistic missile system to protect our cities which is an estimated cost of \$20 billion, and that is no small item. And shelters would certainly have to be built around such cities we are protecting. That is a couple of billion dollars.

He proposes an expansion in our space budget of \$7.5 billion. He says our military space budget is too small, even though we are spending a billion and a half. He asks for immediate construction of another nuclear aircraft carrier, which is about \$400 million. He has really gone down the line for a good many expenditures.

In the same breath, he says balance the budget, and then he says reduce the taxes. I must say that this represents, to be most charitable, rank irresponsibility.

QUESTION. Could we get a determination, please, sir, from Mr. Hoyt as to whether these questions are off or on the record?

comma

X

## 75—RAC—L

Senator HUMPHREY. Everything is on the record here. I presume that is generally the way when I am out on the road.

Mr. SCHER. I might point out that Sigma Delta Chi is strongly supporting the freedom of information bill in the House that is now tied up. You might help us if you can.

Senator HUMPHREY. May I say we have a lot of things to get through that Congress before we leave and most of the boys want to leave.

QUESTION. Senator, the opposition is making a good deal of capital, apparently, of this rioting in the streets issue. What will be the answer of your ticket to that, if any, rioting in the streets.

Senator HUMPHREY. I am very familiar with the issue and I think that again represents an emotional appeal to the American people. I have been a mayor of the city of Minneapolis. I never ever did feel that the Federal Government in Washington was in charge of the police department in my city. In fact, if they had tried to be in charge of it, I think I would have deeply resented it. I don't want to live in a country that has a Federal police. There are some countries that have such institutions and instruments of law and order, as they call them. They generally turn into being anything but instruments of law and order. They become instruments of tyranny and authoritarianism. So we must rely for law and order upon local instrumentality, upon citizen law observance, upon a sense of citizen morality. Most people it has been said obey the law out of habit because we are brought up to be law-abiding citizens.

Now, my fellow Americans, there are people all over the world today who are restless. We came out of a war that shattered not only economies, that destroyed not only cities and social values. It is not possible in a few moments to give a thoughtful, analytical dissertation on what happened to this world following World War I. But after every great war, there are always indications of the change in values or a change in the moral structure, and frequently not for the good.

But Mr. Goldwater's constant reference to rioting in the streets is an unfair picture of America.

Most people are law abiding. Why doesn't he tell you about the traffic accidents? There are more of them today than there have ever been, too. And there are more people that overpark their cars today than ever before. And there are more people today, if you please, that get into little troubles because there are more people. And this is a more crowded and a more highly geared-up society.

I think that this constant charge of disorder and lawlessness which has been made, which has not just been referred to certain specific instances, but a general charge, is an insult and an unfair comment. It is an insult to every law enforcement officer, to every mayor, to every chief of police, to every sheriff, to every constable, to every judge, and to every person in public authority.

He was in my city of Minneapolis and made a speech on law and order. Why didn't he say in that city that the former mayor of the city of Minneapolis had been awarded a citation from the Federal Bureau of Investigation during my tenure as mayor for having had the finest record of law enforcement, law and order of any major city in the United States?

We drove out the rackets. We cleaned up a police department and the people of Minneapolis are decent, law-abiding, God-fearing, family-loving people. And I don't need a candidate for President to come into Minneapolis and lecture us on law and order and rioting in the streets. That is number one.

Furthermore, I might add, the gentleman from Arizona is not contributing to a sense of balance and reason and understanding and forbearance and law observance by saying, for example, that the Civil Rights Act promotes bitterness and hatred. And that is what he said, and leads to violence. What he ought to be saying is that it is the duty, the citizen's duty and responsibility of every thoughtful, decent American citizen to try to live by the law, to understand the law, to observe the law, to seek voluntary compliance with the law, and if we can't get it that way, to seek enforcement of the law. That is what we need from every person in America today.

## 76—RAC—L

I don't know what the answer of the Senator is to the youngsters around here in Oregon that had a field day on Labor Day. I don't know what the answer was up in New Hampshire when there were a group of teenagers up there that were having fun and getting a little out of hand. But I am a father and I would be less than honest with you if I told you that once in a while the Humphrey kids couldn't get a little out of line. I don't want them involved in violence, I don't want them involved in riots, and they haven't been, thank goodness. But there are times in this type of geared-up society where you have an automobile in the hands of everybody, where there are old institutions that have been broken down, where families have been moved, where old roots have been cut. There are times when this can get out of hand.

But this doesn't make America a fleshpot. I am tired of hearing about how evil our country is. I don't think it is a bit more evil than it ever was. I think there are more people checking up on each other than ever before. I just left my hometown of Doland, S. Dak., yesterday. I got into a few pranks up there and if they had caught me, they would have said I was a delinquent. The fact of the matter is that most people in America respect the law, love their country, are good citizens, do their job, and they ought to be praised and they ought to be commended. Those that don't ought to be reprimanded, to be sure, and the law ought to be brought upon them.

But let's not go around running down our country. This person is not going to do that. I don't think the young folks of our country today are any worse than you folks were or than I was. I don't think the adults are, either.

You got me on a kind of heartfelt subject, by the way. I will come to Harlem a little later with you.

QUESTION. Senator, last week on "Meet the Press," the founder of the John Birch Society said they will not come out for any candidate. They are supposedly neutral, politically speaking. As you go along the campaign trail, does this seem to be true to you, or is there an undercurrent? Are they really getting into the campaign but saying they are not?

Senator HUMPHREY. The spokesman for the John Birch Society possibly made his first constructive statement when he said they are not going to get into this campaign. I hope they won't. I am not going to accuse anybody of having solicited the support of the John Birch Society. I will say this, that neither Lyndon B. Johnson nor Hubert H. Humphrey wants anything to do with them. The further they are away from us and the less we hear from them, the happier we will be and the happier America will be.

QUESTION. In 1960, this State voted Republican for whoever that was. In 1962, we voted—they voted Republican for Governor. In 1964, why should they change trends?

Senator HUMPHREY. Because they were wrong two times before, that is one of the reasons. And I have a feeling they will change the trend, I really do.

QUESTION. Is the Vietnamese situation as bad as it is reported and are any changes in policy contemplated?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, it is indeed a very complex and difficult situation. It surely is not hopeless. It is not good. But, it will not be improved by running away from it or pretending that you can find some easy answers. This administration does not have any intention of withdrawing from Vietnam and letting the Vietcong, the Communist forces, overrun all of southeast Asia. This administration has no plans of accelerating the war and extending it to the north. This administration intends to pursue what it believes, first of all, is a policy of political pacification, gaining some political stability in South Vietnam, which is a very difficult task but one we think we can obtain in cooperation with the Vietnamese people, and of supporting the Vietnamese Government in its efforts to thwart terrorism, infiltration, and open aggression. And we are going to watch it and take whatever steps are necessary to follow that policy of preserving the political integrity and sovereignty of Vietnam. Once that is obtained and once we find ourselves in a position of relative balance and strength in Vietnam, where the Vietnamese Government has some

## 77—RAC—L

degree of stability, where the military forces of South Vietnam have been able to repel the invaders and the infiltrators, then is the hour and the time to sit down and negotiate. Prior to that, to negotiate would be to negotiate with a gun at your head and we are not yet ready to do that. The sooner we get this across to the people of the world, the better. This Government has no intention of being intimidated, blackmailed, has no intention of sitting down with any Communist force and negotiating on their terms. We will negotiate only when we feel that negotiations can result in a reasonable, honorable settlement, and provide for what was once designed as the policy of South Vietnam, its political nonalignment, its political neutrality, and its territorial integrity. That is our policy.

QUESTION. Senator, do you have any comment to make concerning some of the charges that have been made against you concerning your relationship with ADA?

Senator HUMPHREY. Oh, I expected that. As a matter of fact, you know, if I thought that fellow that is making those charges were serious, I would be worried about them. Really, you ought not to let a former chairman of a political party make any charges for about a year after he is out as head of the party, because he loses his objectivity when he is a part of the political mechanism.

The vice presidential candidate for the other party, the fellow who is making these charges, he is a fine fellow. Somebody prepares this stuff for him and he reads it well. He is a fine actor. I have been with him before. I hope he is enjoying it. I don't mind being the lightning rod for the Democratic ticket and if they think they can strike me down, they should have been in Minnesota. Out in Minnesota, we know the ADA stands for American Dairy Association and we are strongly for it.

QUESTION. I wonder if you would care to comment on lightening striking the Bobby Baker case. Will we get a report on that before the election?

Senator HUMPHREY. I imagine there will be some more reports. There was one already. That case has got about as much attention as you could give to it. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has a number of agents working on it and I don't think that Mr. J. Edgar Hoover is any partisan, he doesn't take any political instructions. It has the Justice Department working on it, it has the Internal Revenue Service working on it, it has most of the Republicans working on it, and a good share of the Democrats. I think it is getting about as much ventilating, airing, analysis, and investigation as anything could. We instructed the committee just the other day, now, to look into these most recent allegations.

I might add that this is a political season and I wouldn't want to impugn anyone's motives, but I sat in the Senate the day before yesterday, and my goodness, I saw a lot of would-be investigators up there making speeches. They weren't half as interested in investigating Persian rugs. Somebody said that we were sweeping things under the rug, and I heard one fellow say that must have been the one that Sherman Adams got. We are not going to sweep anything under anybody's rug, not even Sherman's rug, it will be brought out whatever needs to be.

QUESTION. Senator, you have called attention to the fact that information is one of our most important resources and I know you have been responsible for some hearings on the information explosion. Can you tell us what your plans are on this matter for the future?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, your question refers in particular to information in the scientific and technical areas.

QUESTION. Right.

Senator HUMPHREY. It has been my view that with the Federal Government spending such vast sums of money in the fields of research and development and because, of course, there has been such a large amount spent in the private sector, there has been an information explosion, where the information rolls out much faster than the capacity of the people who need this information to assimilate it. Therefore, what we have been recommending is information centers, so to speak to correlate and collate this volume of information that flows, for example, through the National Institutes of Health. One



## 78—RAC—L

thing we did get done was the cataloging and listing of all research projects, to get away from what appears to be unnecessary duplication. We were finally able to get in the Department of Defense now, through a system of these computer machines, 120,000 research projects where all of the information, all the material developed from these research projects is now indexed, collated, and extracted so that it is readily available to industrial firms, to private individuals, and to scientists all over the United States. It is my view that an information clearinghouse, for example, on drugs, being a pharmacist, is very important. Had we had it, there never would have been the problem with thalidomide. There would never have been the problem with some of the other drugs we presently have.

Instead of being critical of the particular drug firms that have developed these products, what has actually happened is that much information has been available but not known to a particular firm. And it needs to be worldwide, not just in the United States.

So we have made some approaches. We already have a world health organization on getting together the beginnings of an international drug and medical information clearinghouse. The American Medical Association now, in cooperation with the drug companies and the American Pharmaceutical Association, is now setting up a huge clearinghouse on drug information.

And the Government of the United States is beginning to do this now in the Food and Drug Administration and in the Public Health Service. So we are making progress.

But you have to keep at it. This isn't one of those things that has any political sex appeal. It doesn't. This is just a labor of love and you have to work at it and work on it.

I have held hundreds of hearings on it and we have taken hundreds of pages of testimony, but we are working on it and it will be to the benefit of the country.

QUESTION. Senator, several months ago, Thomas Mann was quoted as saying that we no longer particularly cared what kind of governments Latin American countries had so long as they lined up with us against communism. Since the Alliance for Progress is based pretty heavily upon reforming government, and quite a few of the governments need reform, what is the future of the Alliance now?

Senator HUMPHREY. First of all, my friends, I do not believe that Mr. Mann was properly interpreted or even quoted, if that was the case.

QUESTION. It was an AP story.

Senator HUMPHREY. I know Mr. Mann and know him well.

This Government is committed to the development of constitutional governments in Latin America. We also recognize that there are times that we have to deal with governments here and elsewhere that are not freely elected. But we do not encourage it, we deplore it, and we seek in our negotiations to promote in the most rapid fashion possible constitutional processes to have free elections.

Take, for example, in the Argentine and now in Brazil. We are insisting in our relationships in Brazil that the date for free elections and the restoration of constitutional government, elected constitutional government, be set as soon as possible.

Mr. Mann is committed to the Alliance for Progress and Hubert Humphrey is committed to the Alliance for Progress, and President Lyndon Johnson, above all, is committed to the charter of Punta del Este, to the Alliance for Progress and to the Organization of American States. And I believe you will see and you are witnessing a much better relationship in Latin America with our country than before.

Of course, Mr. Kennedy, the late beloved President, was really the inspiration for the Alliance for Progress, and he left a tremendous impact in this area of the world.

But I would remind you that in the recent meeting of the OAS, 13 of the 14 countries have now—there is only one country that has not, up to date, applied sanctions to Cuba and that one is Mexico; and Mexico has a traditional policy of recognition, of doing business with any country in Latin America that has a regime in power. But even Uruguay, which we thought might not be with us, has come through. I think we have done quite well and I want to assure you that our com-

## 79—RAC—L

mitment is as strong as it ever was. If Hubert Humphrey is permitted to serve with President Lyndon Johnson, I know I will be able to help make that commitment not only a promise and a pledge but a full-fledged reality.

QUESTION. Thursday morning, prior to flying to Minneapolis from Seattle, Senator Goldwater said he wouldn't be a bit surprised to see another Cuban crisis arise before the election. Do you have any comment on that?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, my comment on that, I think, was better stated by a great journalist and columnist and commentator, Mr. James Reston, than anything I might say.

I can only paraphrase what he said but what he said was the truth. Mr. Goldwater was, regrettably, insinuating that the crisis in 1962 was a sort of politically manipulated matter, which it was not, and as has been indicated, the removal of those missiles—first of all, the ascertaining of the presence of the missiles, was ascertained to a specific date by our overflights by the United States, by the Central Intelligence Agency. And all Mr. Goldwater has to do is to take advantage of the opportunity which the President of the United States has made available to him to see every report of this Government, to have all of the information of the Central Intelligence Agency, all of the information of the intelligence services of the Air Force, the Army, or the Navy or any other instrument of our Government.

And he does not either dignify himself or give honor to his rank as a reserve general when he makes these insinuations and these misleading comments about critical international developments and situations.

We are not going to have any timely Cuban crisis. If there is a Cuban crisis or any other crisis, it will be met, whatever day it comes. And we don't intend to have political profit on the basis of crisis or misery. This administration is running on the basis of a program of opportunity and of happiness and of hope and of a better future for the American people, not on our troubles and our difficulties.

Anyone else?

QUESTION. Senator, I wonder what the views of the administration are toward the development of an oil shale industry, particularly in Colorado, with some allied interest in Wyoming and Utah?

Senator HUMPHREY. I really can't give you a detailed answer on it because it is not always possible for one to know all the intimate details of a program. But the Democrats helped initiate the pilot projects for the development of an oil shale industry. We are interested in the development of our natural resources.

I would speak, speaking for myself, and I served in the Congress with the distinguished Senator, Ed Johnson, and your distinguished Senator, John Carroll, and I think that we always worked together to preserve the beginnings of that great industry. I would hope that I could give you an assurance that the Democrats will be for the development of whatever natural resource we have any place in this country, including oil shale.

QUESTION. Senator, how do you answer this well known sense of frustration that we feel that this country can't have its way all over the world? The other side of that question might be, can we be a policeman in all this crisis and change in the world?

Senator HUMPHREY. It appears to me that our political opposition is playing on the frustrations of the American people. We are a can-do people, you know. We like to get things done. We generally face up to emergencies in an emergency way, you know, just tearing into it.

One of the characteristics of America in the past, in the foreign policy and its defense policy, for a long period of time was either all out, or dead stop. We never found a cruising speed. We either had little or no defense or we had massive armies on the occasion of a war. For a long period of time, we said the rest of the world would have to take care of itself, we were isolated, we had total isolation, so to speak, from the rest of the world.

There is a tendency now on the part of some people to want to try to dictate to people all over the world. We have gone from one extreme to the other in the minds of some. At one time we wanted to have nothing to do with people, now have everything to do with them and tell them what to do.

## 80—RAC—L

We are not in that position any more. The power structure has changed a great deal. For a time after World War II, there were two major powers, the Soviet Union with its massive armies and the United States of America. But now things have changed.

First of all, the Soviet Union can't even boss its own satellite countries. It is split not only down the middle but pie-like all over. But the basic split is between the Soviet Communists and the Chinese Communists.

We in the United States, while we have massive power, while we have the greatest conglomeration of power that the world has even known, we are not in a position, unless we want to be sheer imperialists, which we do not want to be, of dictating to everybody and telling everybody to behave or impose our will. Therefore, what we seek to do is demonstrate through the organizations available to us, through the United Nations, through the World Bank, through the Inter-American Development Bank, through the Organization of American States, through the alliances like NATO, SEATO and CENTO. This is a complicated process. What I would advise Americans to do is to recognize that you are living at a time when the old world was shattered and a new world is being created and constructed. The question is, can we help mold the design and the pattern of this new world in the framework of greater freedom for more and more people, of greater opportunity for more and more people?

Now, this will not come because we order it. It can come if we build it. I think the greatest speech that John Kennedy ever gave was that speech at American University on June 10, 1963, when he reminded everyone of us that peace is a process. You must work for it. You must build it stone by stone and step by step and inch by inch and year by year. If you try to create it at once, it can only be done by massive force and that surely is no peace. If you ignore it, the challenge of peace, it will result in a complete breakdown of social order and an imposition of totalitarian structure.

So what we need is some confidence in ourselves. We didn't build this America that we live in today overnight. You didn't build the West as it is today in just one decade or even one generation. It took a long time. And anyone who believes in the democratic process knows that it takes infinite patience and perseverance. You have to be patiently persevering without becoming impatient and impetuous. You have to be firm and resolute without becoming bellicose and arrogant. And you have to develop what instrumentalities are needed to encourage development, encourage the design of the kind of a world in which there is greater freedom, greater opportunity. So if we are frustrated, the only thing I can say about that is if the American people yield to frustration, then the Communists have won their victory. But if we discipline ourselves to the long ordeal of creating the kind of a society that we know and that other people know is needed, a society in which human dignity is the central objective and ideal, the attainment and the protection of human dignity, if we can discipline ourselves to a process that will ultimately yield a greater respect for human dignity, then we are the victors. And the real difference between the totalitarian society and our society is the respect for the dignity of man. That is the difference, the ultimate difference. I am not going to do anything—well, I hope I will never do anything, either privately or publicly, that will reveal a temptation to the frustrations of our time.

Actually, my friends, we are winning. You think we have problems? You think we have difficulties? Look at the difficulties around the world in the Communist bloc. We are winning. Western Europe is strong; it is so strong that it can talk back to us. It is so rich that it is its own banker again. Latin America is making improvements.

Oh, I know there are problems. But there are more textbooks in Latin America tonight than there have been ever before in all the great history of that continent. And we helped print them and they talk the story and they read the story of human freedom and dignity.

There are more children in Latin America today receiving a free school lunch than in all the previous history of that continent. There are more free governments in Latin America elected today than ever before.

## 81—RAC—L

The Communists aren't winning.

Mr. Khrushchev himself every day has to yield on a point of dogma and doctrine. He goes back into the eastern provinces, as he calls them, back into Siberia, and what does he tell his farmers? "You must have incentive." He praises capitalist agriculture.

What does he tell his governments that he manages? He says "we have got to give more freedom to our scientists." The fresh air of freedom has broken through the Iron Curtain.

This country hasn't gone Communist or Socialist. There is more free enterprise and more profitable free enterprise and more freedom in America today than there has ever been in the history of our great Nation. More people are free to go to school. More people are going to school. More people are free because of their jobs and their income. You are free to get into your car and drive half way across the continent, or all the way if you want to. You are free to change your job. You are free to vote or not to vote. You are free to vote for Goldwater, though I hope you don't do that.

We have all kinds of freedoms. So I think we are doing all right.

Denver, Colo.  
Labor Center,  
September 12, 1964

### REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY AT COPE STATE CONVENTION

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, Herrick. Thank you for a rousing reception here.

I want to thank every one of our good friends of the AFL-CIO, of these good, progressive, fine people of Colorado for a reception that I am sure has been heard all the way back to the White House.

I have been to Denver many times, and I can think of no time when everything looked brighter and looked more promising, more optimistic, than at this particular moment. Why even the skies are lit up with the sun in the heaven and it just tells me that this is the kind of day that people ought to be thinking about how they can be sure to get two or three more votes from friends and neighbors, and for L.B.J. and H.H.H.

By the way, while you are doing that, don't forget we have a Congress, too, because some people seem to feel that it is just fine, you know, to vote for a Democrat for President and then send a Republican down there to cancel out the work that the President wants to get done. So you just continue now to vote for Byron Rogers and Wayne Aspinall.

And I noticed in looking over the checksheet here that you folks have been politically sinning part of the time, because you have a couple of Republican Congressmen. Now, this can be remedied. It doesn't take too much to do it. And particularly out there in the second district, where you ought to be able to elect Roy McVicker handily.

And after having met Frank Evans this morning, I know you are going to elect him. So get on with your job.

I am not going to name all your local candidates. You know who they are. But when in doubt, vote Democratic, just remember that.

The first thing I want to say to you so that I don't forget it, because I didn't come here with any big, prepared speech, I came here to see friends, and I gather that there are plenty of them here today. The first thing I want to tell you is that despite the fact that the public opinion polls look good, and they are, and they have never been so good for any Democratic or Republican nominee for President in the history of our country, despite all that, the real goal that is important is that polling booth, that election booth on election day. I want to say to our friends here at COPE and of the AFL-CIO that you see to it that you get everybody registered. You see to it on election day that you get all your friends and neighbors and relatives, and even folks that you may not know as friends, see that you get them there to the election box to vote and if you get them there, we will trust their judgment.



## 82—RAC—L

And I think they are going to vote Democratic, don't you?

Somebody told me that we have to worry about political apathy. I don't think it is political apathy we need to worry about. What we need to worry about is if that gentleman from Arizona should, by some way or manner, get into that White House.

And I suggest to you that since he loves his home State so much, you give him the privilege of remaining there for the next 4 years. Well, now, why should you do that?

Well, as I said a little while ago, since we are now entering on the football season, when you have a team that is going down the field and scoring touchdowns like this Democratic team, for goodness sakes, don't take them out and put in a lot of substitutes. And when you have a quarterback who knows how to call the signals and how to make those touchdowns and how to run straight toward the goal line, don't put a fellow in that gets the signals loused up and runs backwards.

In other words, what we need between now and election is some mighty good, clean, hard, downfield blocking to clear the way. And then what we need to do is to keep that man who knows how to govern this Nation, how to give this Nation leadership, to keep him right on the job in the White House and make sure that he is going to have 4 more years there to work for you and to work for me, to work for America and to work for a free world.

And that man is Lyndon B. Johnson.

I was out in South Dakota yesterday. Oh, we had a great time. I was in my old home town, the county where I was born, the town where I went to grade school and high school. I was in Huron, S. Dak., where my brother and my mother live, and where Humphrey's Drug Store is—I always get a commercial in, you know. If you ever drive through, stop in. And we had a wonderful time.

Last night I spoke to a fine audience in our local hometown arena, and I spoke primarily to farm people, because that is a great agricultural area. And I recited there some of the words of the temporary spokesman of the Goldwater faction of the Republican Party.

I said according to Mr. Goldwater—this is what he said—"I don't know anything about farming." And I took him at his words and so did the farmers.

But I think you ought to beware. This fellow does claim to be some sort of an expert on labor. But what an expert. He would like nothing better than to see the so-called misnamed right-to-work laws enacted in every State and every union member knows what this would mean to his union, to his job security, and to his organization. And you are not going to let that happen, are you?

Now, my good friends, I thought we had arrived at a time in this country when most everybody agreed on a few things. As I recall, in the Congress of the United States, most everyone, including Republicans and Democrats alike, believes in, strongly supports and promotes, the extension of social security, but not Senator Goldwater.

You really got the message all right.

I don't think we ought to be too critical, however. I will tell you why. Mr. Goldwater is coming close to being for social security. Somebody said that he wasn't in the mainstream of Republicanism. Listen, he hasn't even come close to the shoreline yet, never mind the mainstream. But he has now indicated—of course, it could change—that he believes that if he were elected President, which is only a theoretical exercise, may I say—if he were, that he could still support some form of social security. Now, it has taken him 28 years to arrive at that position, but for this, I want to express a note of gratitude.

I thought that most everybody in America, business and labor, Congressmen and Senators, Republicans and Democrats alike, were for minimum wages and at least \$1.25 an hour minimum wage.

But not Senator Goldwater.

As an old teacher, I want to say you are doing well on this message.

Then, as you know, this past year, after better than 1 year of study and 1 year of very careful examination of the revenue needs of our country and what was needed to stimulate this economy, to fulfill that promise that John Kennedy gave us to get this country moving again, as you know, after a year of study, and as my friends in the House

## 83—RAC—L

know, after a year of hearings in the House Ways and Means Committee, the Congress of the United States, most Democrats and most Republicans, agreed and passed this massive tax cut that released \$11.5 billion of capital for American business and American labor and American farmers and American consumers to spend.

But not Senator Goldwater.

Right. Go to the head of your class.

This seems to be repeated, regrettably, time after time. And I intend to repeat it, because I think the people of America ought to know it. The Democratic administration found a country in 1961 with an economy that was stagnant, with unemployment rising, with our gold reserves fading, with young people walking the streets, with school dropouts increasing, with serious problems in many areas of this great land of ours. And we set to work to do something about it. And we passed in the Congress of the United States, for example, an area redevelopment program to put to work the Federal Government and the State government and labor and capital and business and unions, to put them together to work to build jobs, to put new industries up, to make America a better place.

And I am happy to say that on final passage, we had an overwhelming vote for that bill.

But there, again, not Senator Goldwater.

And the same was true of accelerated public works. And there isn't a single person that doesn't know that there is a great need in America for better public facilities, for sewage disposal plants, for hospitals, for courthouses, for roads, for streets, for a host of things to give people work when they want to work.

Americans want to work. Americans want good jobs. Americans want to build America so the Congress of the United States, under the leadership of John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson, brought to us a program of public works for communities where there were unemployed, where there were needs to be fulfilled. And the Democratic administration passed that bill.

But not with the help of Senator Goldwater. Not a bit.

Then, my friends, housing, urban renewal—I come through your beautiful city of Denver. I go to my own lovely and wonderful city of Minneapolis, and I see block after block that has been cleaned out of slums and old buildings under urban renewal. I see homes that have been constructed, public housing for low-income groups. These are programs that have been fashioned by Democratic administrations, and I am happy to say again, my dear friends, in most instances, most Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike voted for the great national housing program presented to the Congress by Presidents Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson.

But not Senator Goldwater.

That is the refrain, time after time, no, no, no, against, against, against. Then he wants to lead the Nation. Where? Back? Far back. And we are not about ready to let him have it.

The same thing was true in higher education which means so much to this great organization of labor. We are going to have to build more classrooms. We ought to have as the theme for every American—opportunity. Give our young people a chance, equip them with better education, make our universities and our high schools and our secondary schools, make our great schools of technology and vocational schools, make them the best in the world. That is what this administration has been trying to do and we did it. And we put the money on the line. We passed the legislation, and I am happy to say that a majority of the Congress voted for it.

But not Senator Goldwater.

And it goes down the line. And everything we can think of.

I don't want to keep you much longer.

But even on the great issues, on the most fundamental issues of our time, of slowing down this nuclear arms race, of keeping the atmosphere that we breathe clean from radioactive pollution, of seeing to it that a little child can drink a glass of milk without it being filled with strontium 90, of seeing to it that somehow sanity can be

## 84—RAC—L

brought amongst the affairs of men in this world, a great President and a Vice President and a Secretary of State negotiated a tremendous accomplishment in the field of foreign policy. We negotiated and we ratified the nuclear test ban treaty. And I am happy to say here that over three—yes, better than that, four-fifths of the Members of the U.S. Senate voted for sanity, voted for decency, voted for clean air, voted for wholesome milk, voted to slow down the nuclear arms race.

But not Senator Goldwater. That is the most serious issue of all. Then it came to the matter of where we stand on citizenship in this country. And let me tell you that the issue of civil rights is not a partisan issue. It never was and it never should have been.

A great Republican by the name of Abraham Lincoln was the author of the Emancipation Proclamation. He gave the promise of freedom and it was for this administration and for our generation to make that promise a reality. We have only one Constitution. There is only one kind of citizenship and that is American citizenship. And if there is anything that this America of ours is dedicated to, it is to human dignity, it is to human equality, it is to equal opportunity.

And the civil rights bill before the Congress was a moral necessity. It was a moral issue. It was a national issue. And that moral issue had to be met. And that national issue had to be resolved.

And you know and I know that an overwhelming majority of the members of the House of Representatives, Republicans and Democrats alike, 152 Democrats, 138 Republicans, voted for the civil rights bill.

And the same thing was true in the U.S. Senate, where even the Republican minority leader was one of the architects of the civil rights bill.

There it was. There was the opportunity for America to vote to show clean hands to the world and say that we welcome people because they are people, that we respect human dignity, that we believe in humanity, that we are going to erase from America if we possibly can, this smear, this smirch, and this blight of discrimination and intolerance and bigotry. And we put the issue, and I am happy to tell you that an overwhelming majority voted for it.

But not Senator Goldwater.

Those are the great issues. And I don't want to cheapen those issues, either, by a refrain. But I ask my friends in the labor movement now to roll up your sleeves and go to work. I ask you to remember that this is a different election than any you have ever had before. There are forces at work in this country today that if they get their way will change America. And we are not about ready to let it happen. We built a great America, an America dedicated to social progress, an America dedicated to opportunity for the young, to compassion for the afflicted, to dignity for the elderly, an America that believes that Government and people can work together as friends and partners and not be considered as enemies. That is the kind of America, my friends, that Lyndon B. Johnson wants and that is the kind that he hopes to keep and that is the kind that he hopes to build.

And I am on this ticket for one purpose: to bring the message to America of the promise of America, of the achievements thus far. And I am here to ask you to work as you have never worked before in your lives to make sure that these forces of bitterness, of division, of disunity, yes, these forces that would lead the American people backward, that those forces are repudiated and that those who believe in a future and in a better America are elected, and that means the election of Lyndon B. Johnson as President.

---

Denver, Colo.  
Denver Hilton Hotel.  
September 12, 1964,

### PRESS CONFERENCE OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. I don't want to keep you waiting. I know you all have things to do. I should like to open this conference by just saying hello and telling you how much I have enjoyed this very beautiful day in Denver.

## 85—RAC—L

From there on out, why don't you start asking your questions?

QUESTION. Senator, one of the things you have been called by Senator Goldwater is the most radical member of the U.S. Senate—the most liberal, excuse me. Do you consider that a politically disadvantageous description?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I hope that I am a progressive and thoughtful man in the U.S. Senate and out of the Senate. To be called a liberal is surely not a word of derogation. I would think it would be a word of compliment.

Woodrow Wilson was a great American liberal. Abraham Lincoln was a great liberal. George Norris and a few others—Franklin Delano Roosevelt. And I consider it a compliment to be known as a responsible American liberal.

QUESTION. Senator, Congressman Miller, in his opening blast in the campaign, referred to your membership in the ADA. Your reply didn't say anything about the issue on that. Do you subscribe to the thoughts of ADA unequivocally?

Senator HUMPHREY. I subscribe to the Democratic platform and to my record in the Congress of the United States and to the platform of the Democratic Party in 1964, and to my own conscience and convictions. There are times when the platforms or the program of other organizations met the standards that I set for myself and my party. When that is the case, why, we agree.

If the gentleman from New York would spend a little more time reading the Congressional Record instead of his own publicity releases, he would have a better idea about the kind of record we have in Congress. But, as I said before, I don't think he is really serious about all this, anyway.

QUESTION. You only agree with the ADA as long as it agrees with the Democratic platform?

Senator HUMPHREY. I agree with the Democratic platform and support it, and I think you know that and we are not going to play word games.

QUESTION. But you haven't answered the question raised by Congressman Miller, that the ADA, as far as the recognition of Red China as one issue he threw out. The question is here, do you support that position of the ADA of which you happen to be a member?

Senator HUMPHREY. I think it is more important to know what Senator Humphrey's position is. I have constantly opposed recognition of Red China, including its admission into the U.N., and Congressman Miller knows it, and a man who seeks high public office should always try to state the truth.

QUESTION. Senator, how would you characterize your role in this campaign as distinguished from the role the President is going to play?

Senator HUMPHREY. The President will obviously be very busy as President of the United States. These are troublesome times on the international front. They are days that require constant attention to the responsibilities of the Government of the United States. President Johnson will spend a good deal of his time in Washington as our Chief Executive and as our President. I will try, to the best of my ability, to conduct, carry on the campaign for our ticket and attend as many meetings as possible and visit as many States as time will permit. I will have to do this also in recognition of my responsibilities as majority whip of the U.S. Senate, which at this time, of course, means I have to be in Washington a good deal of the time.

QUESTION. Senator, when is Congress going to wind up?

Senator HUMPHREY. Mr. Mazo, I hope that it winds up very promptly, and I would say that we have a chance to get the Congress wound up—we have a chance for the Congress to complete its work before the—by the final week of September, I would say, somewhere around September 25, not later than October 1.

QUESTION. Senator, are you saying that most of the campaigning around the country will be done by you rather than the President?



## 86—RAC—L

Senator HUMPHREY. It appears that at least for some time, until the Congress has completed its work, that I will carry on a good deal of the campaigning. But the President will, of course, participate and very effectively so. I gather that his schedule is primarily related to the month of October. He will do a good job when he goes out. You don't have to have the champ out too many times, you know.

QUESTION. Senator, Barry Goldwater is claiming a strong tide in the West. Do you think that your visit alone, without the President's help, will offset that tide?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I would imagine that just conducting the affairs of Government would be the best way to gain support in the West. If any one man seems to have popular support in the Western States, as I have traveled through these States many times in the past year, it is President Lyndon Johnson. Campaign or no campaign, he has support.

The best politics is just to do what you are supposed to do when you are in Government, when you have the responsibility of public office. And the programs of the Democratic administration, I believe, are well accepted in the West and are appreciated and supported, and I hope that I can add just a little to the strength of the ticket by coming out here to explain these programs, to again proclaim them and remind people of them.

QUESTION. Senator, do you know if President Johnson will come to Colorado in October?

Senator HUMPHREY. I do not. I hope he will, because I know he would receive a great reception here. But I have no information that tells me that this is currently planned.

QUESTION. Senator, would you like to campaign in either Alabama or Mississippi or both?

Senator HUMPHREY. If I am asked, I would be more than happy to go there. As a matter of fact, it is my intention to go into as many States in the South as time will permit. As you know, in the press, next week I will be in Arkansas and Texas. I have also been invited into Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Florida. I hope to be able to go and I will go into Kentucky and Tennessee and Oklahoma and Louisiana. And I have been invited to the University of Alabama. If I can find it in my schedule, I hope that I can accept it.

QUESTION. What tack will your campaigning take in the South?

Senator HUMPHREY. Just like it takes any other place. There is only one country, just one United States, one law for all of our people and on Constitution. I, of course, will speak to them of some of the programs in which they are particularly interested and the programs that the Democratic Party has been able to advance.

For example, our southern friends and neighbors are deeply interested in agriculture. I shall cite to them the record of the Democratic administration and of the President, and Senator Humphrey as compared to the opposition.

I will talk of industrialization, of economic development and opportunity of civil rights, every issue.

QUESTION. Will you emphasize civil rights?

Senator HUMPHREY. I will give it the emphasis that it properly deserves, yes, sir.

QUESTION. Goldwater said yesterday in Chicago again that he didn't think he had quite as much support down South as a lot of Republicans think he might have. What is your view?

Senator HUMPHREY. I will accept Mr. Goldwater's verdict. He is getting closer to the truth all the time.

QUESTION. Senator, would you be responsive to any invitation to debate the issues publicly with any of the candidates for the opposition?

Senator HUMPHREY. I have always considered that we are conducting a debate all the time. I keep reading what the Republican candidates say, and I imagine occasionally they read what we are saying. I am hopeful that the people are reading and listening and viewing what we are saying. If the time is appropriate and the occasion arises, I would have no hesitancy at all in engaging in discussion or debate if it would prove to be profitable or interesting.

QUESTION. Have you had any such invitation?

Senator HUMPHREY. Not yet.

## 87—RAC—L

QUESTION. Were you disturbed by the fact that Senator Goldwater chose your hometown of Minneapolis to talk about lawlessness?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, I was at least intrigued, because of all the cities in the United States that has a fine record for observance, law and order, for good government, I think Minneapolis ranks among the top numbers of those cities. It is a city of homes and of churches and good schools and responsible, law-abiding citizens. But Mr. Goldwater seems to be trying to make a campaign issue out of local law enforcement. As I have said a number of times, when I was mayor and candidate for mayor, I ran on the issue of local law enforcement. But I don't believe as a candidate for President you try to take over the duties of the local chief of police or the mayor.

I think it might be a little more helpful if the Republican candidate for President were to encourage law observance and not only by asking that the law be enforced, but also that the social and economic conditions in this country, wherever they may be faulty, be improved.

I wish he would show as much interest in the housing of people who are poorly housed, in the education of students, of young people who are poorly educated, as he does in lecturing chiefs of police and mayors and Governors about their failure to keep law and order in their communities.

I think what some of our local officials would like is a little cooperation and help on some of the basic social problems which tend to promote social tension.

QUESTION. Senator, do you feel that this emphasis on local law enforcement by the opposition party is really a way of emphasizing the civil rights issue?

Senator HUMPHREY. I have been forced to that conclusion, because Mr. Goldwater has said, regrettably, I must say, that the Civil Rights Act promotes hatred and violence and bitterness. I don't think that is true at all. I think that those forces were present before the act. And it should be stated now, and this is as good a place to say it as anywhere else, that most of the public officials of this country have spoken up for the observance of the law. And in the Southern States, there is a pattern of law observance and of compliance with the civil rights statutes that is nothing short of amazing in the recent weeks since the passage of that act. These States ought to be praised for the adjustments that they are making and these adjustments have not been easy; we know that. It is not easy to change the long-established social patterns. But very little praise has been given to them.

So I raise my voice in commendation, in praise, and in thanks for the courage and for the cooperation of citizens everywhere and of law enforcement officials and public officials, north and south and east and west, in reference to the application of a civil rights bill that emphasizes voluntarism and local cooperation.

QUESTION. Senator Goldwater keeps referring to rioting in the streets. How would you describe that—his remarks?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I have tried to indicate to you that I think that this is taken, really, out of the context of the totality, of the fullness of American life, specific instances and making it appear as if it is a national pastime, or a national pattern.

It is very peaceful in Denver today, beautiful city. People look fine and healthy and well dressed. There are fine public institutions here, you have a fine mayor. You have been doing great things in the great West here, all over. I would say that there are problems of law enforcement, they are best handled by your local people.

QUESTION. Senator, do you consider Goldwater to be a sane, responsible conservative, and if so, do you think he is a prisoner of the nuts and the kooks?

Senator HUMPHREY. Oh, I wouldn't make any such charge as that. I have said a number of times, and I want to repeat it, that I have a fine personal relationship with Senator Goldwater and this is not just a political statement; it is a fact. I respect him as a man and as a fine citizen. I disagree with his point of view very strongly and many people gather around, candidates that are anything but helpful, and

## 88—RAC—L

all I ask of the Senator is that when persons who do not seem to fit into the ideals of American life support him, that he repudiate and reject their support, just as I would. We need no Ku Kluxers, no Birchites, no Communists, no extremists. We don't need their support and we reject it. And that is a statement for the Democratic candidates.

QUESTION. Thank you very much, Senator.

Denver, Colo.  
Denver Auditorium  
September 12, 1964

### REMARKS BY SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY

The pioneers who fought and trudged and thirsted and starved their way west were sustained by visions of a better life for themselves and their children. They surveyed the rich land. They gazed at the shining sky and the towering mountains. They breathed in the clean sweet air, and they said "Yes—yes." This is the land and we are the ones to bring reality to our dream.

Those pioneers boldly said "Yes" to life—"Yes" to nature—"Yes" to America. We today must humbly, yet emphatically, also say "Yes" to life—and to its challenges.

We contrast our affirmation of hope of the "No—no—a thousand times no" of the temporary spokesman for the Republican Party.

When we sought to guarantee the basic rights of human dignity under the Constitution, Americans said "Yes" and we passed a Civil Rights Act.

But Senator Goldwater said "No."

When we finally achieved an opportunity to end the pouring of radioactive, lethal poison into the air, Americans said "Yes" and we ratified a test ban on airborne nuclear explosions.

But Senator Goldwater said "No."

When we agreed that a carefully formulated tax cut would provide the necessary stimulus to continuing prosperity, Americans said "Yes" and we passed the Tax Reduction Act of 1964.

But Senator Goldwater said "No."

When, in this great land of plenty, we found somber pockets of degradation, of hunger, of hopelessness, Americans said "Yes" to the Anti-Poverty Act to furnish food and clothes and training and jobs—and, above all, hope, to the poor.

But Senator Goldwater said "No."

When we favored strengthening and encouraging and insuring the survival of the United Nations as one of the vital hopes for world peace, Americans said "Yes" and we approved the bond issue which has kept this organization alive.

But Senator Goldwater said "No."

When we developed a farm program to help the farmer who risks his livelihood against the uncertainties of nature, Americans said "Yes" and we passed legislation to protect the dedicated, hard-working men and women who have made this country the granary of the world.

But Senator Goldwater said "No."

When we discovered the older citizens in this country, through no fault of their own, desperately needing hospital insurance under social security, Americans said "Yes" and we passed the medicare legislation.

But Senator Goldwater said "No."

The Republican platform of 1960 offered specific proposals on 25 major issues.

But Senator Goldwater said "No" to all 25.

How wrong, how irresponsible, how fearful, can a candidate for President get?

What do you say to a candidate with this record of "No," "No," "No?"

Let me tell you: You must say "No—100 million times no" to Senator Goldwater on election day.

"No" demands nothing more; it is an end in itself. But "Yes" opens up the difficult paths of hard work, of experimentation, of creativity—and of progress.

## 89—RAC—L

Americans believe in the open mind. We know that the mind is like a parachute—it functions best when open. The open mind is the society of youth—and those who think young. It is the society of vigor, of challenge, and it says “Yes” to the crucial issues of our times.

The open mind proclaims that all things are possible, and this proclamation leads inevitably to the West’s vital contribution to our Nation: The spirit of discovery.

Discovery was the magic of the dream which kept our pioneers moving forward when maps were vague and security was unknown. Discovery—uncharted, unconforming, unproved—was the elixir which kept our great grandfathers plodding 1 more mile after 1 more mile.

We are now embarked on another exciting age of discovery—we are discovering the secrets of the moon, the sun, and the stars. We are unlocking the mysteries and the might of the atom. But perhaps our greatest discoveries are not those requiring millions of miles of interplanetary travel but those right here on the planet earth.

We are thrilled by the exploits of our astronauts in outer space. But as Americans we should find equal satisfaction in exciting achievements in the human sphere—our recent actions to feed the hungry, to house the dispossessed, and to bind up the wounds of those deprived of the good life by the accident of birth, or the afflictions of old age.

There are those few among us, the naysayers, who reject the very thought of discovery. It shakes them up. It frightens them. It makes them think. It pulls their heads out of the sand.

They battle against every new discovery. They are such prisoners of their negativism that they deny the existence of the great things we Americans have already achieved.

For instance, the temporary spokesman for the Republicans recently accused this Democratic administration of creating an “artificial prosperity” for America.

Would you call the weekly wages of 72 million Americans—up 4.8 million from January 1961—artificial?

Would you call the average factory worker’s weekly wage of \$103 per week—up from \$89 in January 1961—artificial?

Would you call a gross national product of \$625 billion—up 23 percent from January 1961—artificial?

Would you call the unemployment rate of 4.9 percent achieved in July 1964—down from 6.7 percent of January 1961—artificial?

Would you call the record of price stability—held to 1.2 percent each year since 1961—artificial?

Would you call the 43 consecutive months—the longest peacetime economic expansion in history—artificial?

The only artificial aspect of this prosperity is the artificial eyeglasses through which Senator Goldwater looks at these happy and hard facts of a burgeoning, prosperous America.

And what would Senator Goldwater do about changing this “artificially prosperous” land of ours?

Perhaps he would reduce those “artificial” wages so that our “artificially” employed workers would not be able to buy those “artificial” cars so that we wouldn’t use so much “artificial” steel.

But as for me—and as for most Americans—this prosperity is no illusion. It is real. It is here. And we prefer the dream we have achieved to the nightmare offered us by Barry in blunderland.

I believe that the western spirit is best expressed in helping one another: The pooling of resources in the wagon train—pitching in to rebuild a neighbor’s barn burned down—the protection of a widow and her children when a young husband dies.

The West understands frontiers, old and new, better than any other section of our country. For those who say we Americans have no more frontiers to cross—for those who claim we should stop moving ahead and start moving backward—I say this is just some more of Barry’s buncombe.



## 90—RAC—L

Wherever in this great land there is a family which is ill fed, ill clothed, ill housed, I say there is a frontier to be crossed. Wherever there is a bright child who cannot afford to attend a school which will further stretch his mind, I say there is a frontier to be crossed. Wherever there are old people who have been abandoned and cannot pay for the good health which will make their golden years worth living, I say there is a frontier to be crossed. Where there are rat-infested tenements, where there are crime-filled streets, where there are poisoned streams or poisoned minds, I say there are frontiers which the good people in all sections of our country desire to cross.

And cross them we will. For the same spirit which won the West can conquer our new frontiers of waste and disease, of hunger and despair, of futility and fear.

A people which made deserts bloom can make cities sing. A land which has fed the hungry of the world can fire the spirits of the down-trodden. A Nation which has planted the seeds of justice in our Bill of Rights can rip out the weeds of injustice from the tracts of racism and reaction.

We are not afraid of the Ku Klux Klan which would put on white sheets to cloak dark purposes; or some Birchites who would put up the noose of calumny for a courageous Chief Justice; or the Minutemen who would raise the sights of their well-oiled rifles against tolerance and brotherly love. We will not abandon sound judgment to the fury of vigilantes.

But we cannot promise easy answers, sugar-coated solutions, and bland assurances in this day of challenge and crises. The problems of our Nation and of the world are tremendous, and the answers must come not only from the best and the brightest and the most creative men and women, but they must also come from the collective strength and wisdom of all our people. For we believe in the people. We say "Yes" to the people of this magnificent land.

We do not fear a free press which informs the people. We welcome an enlightened electorate which will make a free choice.

We do not believe that every man is good, but we do believe he is capable of good.

We do not believe man has already fashioned the Great Society, but we do believe he has caught an unforgettable glimpse of it, and is on his way.

The West was won by vision, by sacrifice, by courage. And as we possess the qualities today, we shall win the future. From the bottom of my heart, I believe with William Faulkner that "man will not merely endure; he will prevail."

---

Denver, Colo.  
Denver Auditorium  
September 12, 1964

### REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you, thank you very much for a good Democratic welcome. I am very grateful to you.

Ladies and gentlemen, my fellow Democrats, and all of you who are going to be on the victory march between now and November 3, it is mighty, mighty good to be in Colorado. I have had a good time today in your great city and in your great State. I have met many old friends. I have been with my friends in agriculture, our friends in labor, our friends in business, I have been with the folks in every part of your great community. And there is one fact that is very evident—Lyndon B. Johnson is going to be elected President of the United States in November.

There is something else that is rather evident, too. I find that these two incumbent Congressmen that you have, Congressman Byron Rogers and Congressman Wayne Aspinall, are also going to be back to Washington to help Lyndon Johnson.

And just because they need company and because our President is going to need help, you are going to send to Washington Frank Evans and you are going to send Roy McVicker.

## 91—RAC—L

Before I stand before you 1 minute longer, I want to pay my respects to one of the finest Democrats that the West ever produced, the former Governor of this State, the great Democrat and the great progressive, Steve McNichols. And we Senators always stick together. They say it is the most exclusive club in the world. It is hard to get in, it is a good place to stay, you really never should get out unless you run for Vice President.

But I want to say how good it is to be once again in the company of a senior statesman from the West, your own Ed Johnson, and also that fine U.S. Senator and that good friend of mine, John Carroll.

I hope that Bob Maytag will forgive me for being so nonpartisan all day. I have hardly said a partisan word. All I have said all day is that what is good for America is that you vote the Democratic ticket in November. And I am awfully pleased to come to a city that has a nonpartisan Democratic mayor, too.

Let me tell you, I was honored and gratified by the fact that you were willing to take your time to come out there to the airport today to greet me.

So I salute the Democrats of Colorado, and I ask you to get many more of them into our friendly household.

You know, we have been having a great time on this western trip. It started in South Dakota. That is right, there are a few Dakotans here. And I have good news for you, it is going Democratic this year.

And we had sort of a homecoming out in South Dakota. One of the advantages of moving often is that you have a lot of places you can call home. Just 2 weeks ago, we had a homecoming in Minneapolis. Then we had another homecoming where I presently live in a little town called Waverly. Then yesterday, we had a homecoming in Watertown, S. Dak. Then we had a homecoming in Doland, S. Dak. And then we had a homecoming in Huron, S. Dak. And then we had a real, rip-snorting Democratic rally in Rapid City, S. Dak., this morning.

So now I come to the West. I come to Denver, the great city of the West, of the Rockies. And I know that Denver is going to set the pace; Colorado is going to set the pace for electing a man of the West of the 20th century and rejecting a man of the West of the 19th century.

Well, my friends, tonight we are going to talk about pioneering. We are going to have a little visit about discovery. We are going to talk about the America that is ours and the America that can be.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Incomplete.)

---

Albuquerque, N. Mex.  
At the Airport  
September 12, 1964.

### REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, Mr. Schifani. May I now officially and personally thank this very lovely, charming, beautiful young lady, Miss Teenager of New Mexico, for this fine gift that came from the Valley High School Band. I don't know what is in there, but I know it must be excellent. It is far too good for the Senator from Arizona and just right for the Senator from Minnesota.

Mis amigos, saludos, and viva Joe Montoya. Viva L.B.J. And if you don't mind, viva H.H.H.

Let me first of all express my thanks and greetings to your esteemed Governor, my good friend, Governor Campbell, and to your former Governor, Governor Burroughs, and to our Congressman, Tom Morris, and, of course, to your new Congressman, who is going to take Joe's place in the House of Representatives, Johnny Walker.

I want also to say how good it is to meet your lovely county chairwoman, Miss Garcia, and your chairman, Mr. Kiker.

There are, indeed, many more than I would like to pay my respects to tonight, but I gather you have been waiting quite a little while and we are going to have quite a gathering up in Santa Fe tomorrow, so I won't take too much of your time tonight.

## 92—RAC—L

Let me say we left just about a half hour ago a thrilling and exciting, big, huge audience in Denver, Colo. We talked there about the Democratic Party, its commitment to America, its promise for the future. I have noticed as I viewed this audience, when those lights weren't dazzling my eyes so I could see you, let me say again I see this great spirit of the West, the vitality, the youth.

By the way, let me say tonight that we need the young people, we welcome our young people. And we ask every young Democrat and every young citizen for Johnson and Humphrey to redouble your efforts, to see to it that everyone gets out to vote and to see to it that Joe Montoya goes to the U.S. Senate to help Clint Anderson there to help Lyndon Johnson.

You know, as I was coming in on the plane, I asked myself, what might I say there that would be worthy of your attention.

I am very much aware of the fact that this is the "Land of Enchantment." I am very much aware that Albuquerque is indeed a sunshine city, and the sunshine city. But the whole theme of the Democratic Party in this election, and indeed in this period of our history, is to be found right here in New Mexico. And the theme of our party is people, progress, and peace.

It seems to me that when you speak of people, you can think of New Mexico as no other State, because here is a blending of three great civilizations, three great cultures, the culture of the Indian, the Spanish culture, and as some people put it, the culture of the Anglo, all in one great State, one great people that adds so much strength to America.

And the progress here is phenomenal all through the Southwest, fantastic progress, agricultural progress, industrial progress, educational progress, every place you look.

Prosperity—yes, prosperity for more and more people all the time within this progress.

But then, having mentioned people, where you treat people as human beings with dignity, with respect or equality of opportunity is now becoming a fact instead of a theory, may I say the greatest objective of our party is a peace, an honorable peace, a world of freedom, a world of justice, and a world of peace.

Here in New Mexico, the atomic age was born. Your great laboratories at Los Alamos tell the story of the atomic age.

And what is this atomic power for?

It is for a better life. It is the great protector and the defender of the peace. It is the nuclear deterrent of the United States of America which your great laboratories have made possible, that has preserved the peace and has given mankind an opportunity to search for, to look for and to work for and to plan for a better life.

So, indeed, peace and people and progress, the three great concepts, the three great ideals of our Nation and indeed, the three great ideals of our party, are to be found right here in our great sunshine State, this land of enchantment, this great State of New Mexico.

And I salute you for it.

What a wonderful, wonderful achievement is yours.

Now, may I say one other thing, that you are also very fortunate that you have good contact with Texas and the man from Texas is the man that is President of the United States. If New Mexico does as well in 1964 as it did in 1960, when you did just exactly as mind did—*mine*—you cast your vote for John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson—in 1964, all you have to do is to cast your vote for Lyndon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey, and the Democratic ticket, and we will carry on.

We will carry on the very program that John Kennedy launched for America and we will build on that program. We will build and create new programs for our country and our people.

So, Joe, I come to you as a friend. I want to see you in the Senate, and I want to be up there in that presiding officer's chair, so that when Joe Montoya takes his office, it will be a Democratic Vice President that administers it.

Welcome into the Senate, Joe, we welcome you there.

Welcome into Congress, Johnny Walker; we welcome you there.

And welcome back to Congress, Tom Morris, where you have done such a good job.

## 93—RAC—L

Now, listen, it is time to go to work. I would say it is time to go to sleep except I don't want to tell you what to do except to go to work. From here on out, I hope you will buckle down now and make up your mind that America needs a Democratic victory, and it is in your hands. If you really get down and hustle, if you do your job, we can have the greatest victory that the Democratic Party has ever had since 1936, when F.D.R. carried every State but 2, and this time, we will carry all 50.

Thank you.

Albuquerque, N. Mex.  
"Issues and Answers," ABC-TV and radio, KOAT-TV  
September 13, 1964

### REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Guest: Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (Democrat, of Minnesota), Democratic vice presidential candidate.

Interviewed by: Piers Anderton, ABC news correspondent, and John Rolfson, ABC news correspondent.

The ANNOUNCER. On the campaign trail from Albuquerque, N. Mex., rimmed by the Sandia Mountains, we bring you live the first half-hour television interview program with the Democratic nominee for the Vice-Presidency of the United States. Senator Hubert Humphrey, of Minnesota, here are the issues:

What may the administration do about the new crisis in Vietnam?

Does the ADA represent your views?

What are you going to tell the South about civil rights?

To get the answers to the issues from Democratic vice-presidential candidate, Hubert Humphrey, here are ABC News Correspondent Piers Anderton, who is traveling with Senator Humphrey, and ABC News Correspondent John Rolfson, who is covering the Goldwater campaign.

Mr. ROLFSON. Senator Humphrey, the news today is the government we support in South Vietnam has apparently been overthrown again, which adds to the impression that American policy there is floundering pretty badly.

What is your administration doing about this new crisis?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, of course the news reports are still rather incomplete. What I have been able to learn about it is to the effect there has been more or less a peaceful coup, that the number of battalions, Army units in Saigon that have insisted upon a rather dramatic change in the government, with heavier military emphasis and less civilian. There are, of course, as you know, the rather sad differences and unfortunate differences between the Buddhists and the Catholic groups in Vietnam and particularly in Saigon. I think it ought to be crystal clear, however, this matter is not one that indicates any surrender to the Vietcong, to the Communist force. On the contrary, every element is opposed to the Communist force. What we need hope for is for the Vietnamese themselves—that is this handful of leaders at the top of the Vietnamese political, economic, and social structure—to place their country first and their individual differences to be set aside. This has been the encouragement of our Government. General Taylor, our Ambassador, spoke to us about this only recently in Washington, of the desire of our Government, and the emphasis of our Government, the U.S. Government, to encourage the Vietnamese leaders to unite around a common objective.

Now, they are feeling their way yet, John, as to how to put this government together. There have been several shifts of government, as you know, in the last month. General Khanh is still very much an important force in Vietnam and he will continue to be for some time.

Mr. ROLFSON. But doesn't this speak pretty badly for our policy, Senator, and for what we are doing there, that there is a constant shuffle of people on our side?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I think the American people must clearly understand that we can't remake the world in our image. We have to deal with the factors that are present there. What we have sought to do is not to take over Vietnam. What we are seeking to do is to help a government in Vietnam to defend itself. That is for the Vietnamese people to work out their own destiny, to defend themselves.



## 94—RAC—L

Now I don't consider it a failure on our Government's part at all. We are not operating the government of Vietnam. We are not an imperial power. We are a friendly power that has come to Vietnam at the request of a friendly government to give assistance, and we will be there and we will continue to give that assistance. I think it is a little too early to draw definitive conclusions or definitive statements as to what the government will be like. I think it will come out all right, though, in terms of a strong anti-Communist government.

Mr. ROYCE. Well, now, Senator Goldwater has charged again that the administration timed the Cuban missile crisis for maximum political advantage in 1962 and he suggests that the Johnson administration might be planning to do the same thing now in Vietnam to win votes in November.

Senator HUMPHREY. John, I am very sorry that Senator Goldwater has said that. I hope he doesn't really believe that and I don't believe that he really does because the facts are so contrary to his statement. It is a rather cynical statement and a very misleading one. Let's just spend a moment on the Cuban crisis of 1962. Nothing was timed about that in terms of our Government. Everybody knows, every responsible public official of this Government knows, and surely Senator Goldwater knows because he is a Reserve officer and he has contact with the U.S. Air Force, every person knows in any responsible position that the missiles were discovered in Cuba in September and that when those missiles were discovered by aerial reconnaissance, by our U-2 flights, by the U.S. Air Force, that this information was brought to the attention of the responsible officials of our Government. All that Mr. Goldwater would have ever had to do was to consult with John McCone, Director of the CIA, who is a prominent Republican and surely is not a partisan in these matters and he would know there was no timing on the part of President John Kennedy about the crisis in Cuba.

What the president of the United States did was to meet a situation when it developed and, may I say, he met it well. He met it with firmness, with resoluteness, he met it with the kind of courage that the whole world respected. Mr. Khrushchev backed down. Now to say there is any manufactured crisis or any timing crisis in Vietnam, now, is to accuse the President of the United States of manipulating international development that very well might affect the peace and security of the whole world for a narrow political purpose. No man ought to make that charge. The President of the United States is harassed, he is badgered enough by the many problems in this world and he ought not to have a fellow American accusing him of political manipulation of a grave international situation for personal or partisan political purposes. It is just not true. It is the most unkind, the most false statement that anyone could make.

Mr. ANDERTON. Senator, to get back to this country for a moment, you are starting to campaign down South this week. How do you plan to approach the civil rights problem when you are campaigning in the South?

Senator HUMPHREY. Exactly as I would approach it if I campaigned in the North. You can't have one position on these issues in the South and one in the North. I am sure that our friends in the South know what my position is. It has been talked about a great deal. And that position is one of observance of the law, support of the law. After all, many a Southern Senator since the passage of the Civil Rights Act has called upon the people, their States, to support the law, to observe the law. I think the southerners have shown me great courtesy and respect by inviting me to come to their States. I shall go to Arkansas where I shall address the Democratic State Convention. A regional meeting of the Rural Electric Association.

I shall go to Texas and later on I shall go to Georgia, North Carolina, and I hope South Carolina and Florida and possibly Louisiana. The southerners are just like northerners, they have problems and they have many things that they want to talk about and I will be able to talk to our friends in the South about agriculture, about economics, about foreign policy and national security, about education and health. This is all a part of America.

Mr. ANDERTON. Senator, do you think the Southern States have been observing the civil rights law?

rights

X

## 95—RAC—L

Senator HUMPHREY. Piers, I am of the opinion that the Southern States have a remarkable record of compliance and observance with the civil rights statute since its passage. As a matter of fact, I think it is just about time for someone to give them a word of commendation. Today, there is more school integration than there has been at any time in our history. The southern Governors and mayors and public officials are attempting to observe the law and enforce the law. And more importantly the people in the South, in area after area, are observing the law. They are working at a community level to bring about a compliance with the law. And might I say that the whole thrust of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is one of compliance, one of observing the law, one of voluntary cooperation. This is what the Community Relations Service is about. The one that Gov. LeRoy Collins, the former Governor of Florida directs, at the present time. I really just want to give them a word of commendation and congratulations or, as we put it up my way, a pat on the back. I think they have done extraordinarily well.

Mr. ANDERTON. In general it is being said that you have moderated your views in recent years. Do you feel that you have mellowed, that you are restrained?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I am a little older and I would hope with some age there would be what you call maturity.

I know that as one takes on the task of government—and I have been a very active participant in the U.S. Senate—that he senses the importance of his responsibility. I have been taught responsibility all of my life. President Johnson, when he was majority leader of the Senate, had one theme above everything else that he brought home day after day to those of us in the Senate: Be responsible; act responsibly. Put your country above your party. Be proud of your citizenship. And then, yes, be proud of your partisanship but put it in proper perspective.

I think possibly I have mellowed some, yes; I would like to think so and I would suppose some of the sharper edges have been rounded off, but my convictions are the same, sir, my ideals.

Mr. ROLFSON. Senator Humphrey, excuse me. We are going to have to interrupt, here, but we will be back with more issues and answers.

(Announcement.)

Mr. ROLFSON. Senator Humphrey, the Republicans are attacking you for your long association with the Americans for Democratic Action, which Senator Goldwater has called extremely socialistic, with especially dangerous positions on foreign policy. And he said Friday night that you owe an explanation of whether you agree with the ADA stands on certain things such as the admission of Red China to the UN, the abolishment of the Un-American Activities Committee, and unilateral disarmament initiatives.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, of course I expected to be more or less the lightning rod for the fury and the wrath of the Goldwater-Miller combination, and I seem to be serving that function quite well. If I can do this and be of help to President Johnson, I am exceedingly happy.

Yes, I can explain my position. I don't intend to explain it, I intend to assert it. And might I say if Senator Goldwater and his running mate would take a little time to study the Congressional Record instead of their own press releases, they would know what the record is. Senator Humphrey has always opposed the admission of Red China into the United Nations, or recognition of Red China. Senator Humphrey has never recommended unilateral disarmament and doesn't now and I believe that I could say that I have some knowledge of the field of disarmament, of the matter of being able to negotiate from strength and from having put up warning signals time after time as to the importance of maintaining American strength and not being dragged into any form of weakening position or any form of unilateral disarmament.

The other position on the Un-American Activities Committee, I have never recommended its abolishment. Some people have. I have not. I believe in the right of committees of Congress to investigate. I think they should do it responsibly, but I do believe they have that obligation.

## 96—RAC—L

Now actually, of course, Mr. Goldwater has not given a factual and honorable interpretation of the positions of the Americans for Democratic Action. One of the points I would like to make is, as a U.S. Senator my record is a public record and I do not think that it serves the public good of this country for a spokesman of the opposition party, whoever that spokesman may be, to totally distort the printed, known, factual, historical record of a party or of a Senator. We have such a thing as common senatorial courtesy and on the votes in the U.S. Senate there is a record rollcall vote and it seems to me that anyone who attended to his duties would know what that vote was.

Mr. ROLFSON. Of course there is a pretty clear drift in attitude of the Americans for Democratic Action.

Don't you think it is fair, nevertheless, to hold you to some account for this organization's position since you have been a founder and a leader for years and until last month, I guess, vice chairman?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, I must say we owe a great debt of gratitude to this organization for being the most militant and most effective anti-Communist force in the U.S. political scene. This organization did and has continued to battle against any form of infiltration of extreme leftwing elements, in progressing liberal American politics or in any part of the American political structure.

I have noticed that the most bitter critics of the ADA are the Communists on the one hand, the Birchites on the other hand, and now in betwixt these two mad extremes comes the temporary spokesman of the Republican Party. Very strange company, very, very strange company. I wouldn't want to be in that company.

Mr. ANDERSON. Senator, in almost all of your speeches you say Senator Goldwater is not emotionally equipped to be President. Do you plan to elaborate on that statement?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, sir, what I have intended to say, and if I have done him any disservice, I would of course want to apologize, I want to make it clear that my relationships with the Senator from Arizona have been friendly and cordial. I consider him a good American, a fine citizen, a patriot, a man of good character and fine family. I want that on the record.

I disagree with his point of view on many of the political issues of the day. In fact, on most of them.

It is my view that when Senator Goldwater speaks about the use of atomic weapons as if they were little conventional weapons, for example, and he says: "Let's give the use of those weapons and the control of them to the general in the field," that he hasn't thought it through. Or if he has thought it through, then he has a very dangerous thought. There aren't any conventional atomic weapons. The little weapons that he speaks about that are presently in the possession of the U.S. Army in Europe, but are subject to the control of the President of the United States, these weapons are bigger than the bomb that was used at Nagasaki.

Now you don't call that "a little old conventional weapon." I feel that the Senator from Arizona has had some difficulty outlining a consistent position of political philosophy and political program. He votes against a tax bill and a few months later he recommends—a tax cut bill he voted against, the one that cut the taxes over \$11 billion. A few months later he comes around and charges it with being a cynical politically motivated gimmick and then he presents a tax reduction bill of his own, proposal, of 25 percent. One time he says we ought never to be in the United Nations. Another time he says he thinks the United Nations has some value. He at one time condemned social security. A little bit later he will say: "Well, social security may be all right."

I don't know how you would interpret this, but I would say it is at least political instability and in a President you need more firmness of purpose and more stability of position.

Mr. ANDERSON. Senator, you and Senator Goldwater will appear on the same platform this week in connection with the plowing contest at Fargo. What are you going to say about the problem of farm surplus?

## 97—RAC—L

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, first I am going to recite the record of the Democratic vice presidential candidate and the Democratic presidential candidate and the Democratic Party on agricultural legislation. I then will recite the record of the Republican nominee and of his running mate, and I feel that the farmers who will be in attendance at that meeting will know the difference between those two records and they will know that the Democratic administration has been the friend of the American farmer.

I will say something about what are charged to be or alleged to be surpluses. I think the time is at hand for a country that has worldwide responsibilities, when famine stalks the earth in many of the friendly countries that are associated with us, that we have strategic national reserves, for our own national purposes and for international purposes.

Now over and above those what you may call strategic national reserves, there may be surpluses but I don't really think, you know, (comma) X you ought to call a stockpile of feed grains, say, for 45 days, a surplus. As a matter of fact, you are running a pretty close inventory. So we will talk a little bit about that.

The real miracle of America today is the miracle of America's agriculture. That is one of the great assets we have.

Mr. ANDERSON. But don't we have large surpluses in butter and wheat?

Senator HUMPHREY. Oh, no. No, Piers. On butter, we don't have any surplus of butter at all at the present time. We have some surplus of vegetable oils but that is moving very rapidly and we are developing great commercial markets for those oils. We have surpluses of wheat, but not large surpluses in terms of milling wheat. Some of the wheat that is available is for feed purposes, and I believe if you look over the weather map of America this year you will see large areas of this great Nation of ours in drought, and these feed stocks have been vitally important to our cattlemen, vitally important for our whole livestock industry. Had we not had some of these stocks, we could have had an economic catastrophe for many of our farm people.

Mr. ROLESON. Senator Humphrey, how do you respond to Senator Goldwater's charge that the administration's lack of leadership, and by the poor moral example it sets, it bears a responsibility for turning the streets into jungles, encouraging lawlessness, bringing our public and private morals to the lowest state of our history?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I know this issue has been talked about considerably. In fact, it seems to be the central theme of the Goldwater attack.

First of all let me make it crystal clear that, as a former mayor of a great city, the city of Minneapolis, I know something about law enforcement. I believe in law enforcement. I neither condone nor will in any way try to explain away violence or riots, disorder, or looting. You cannot have this. I think I can speak for the national administration that within the limits of our constitutional powers, since we have no national police force and ought not to have one, every resource of the Federal Government is made available to State government, to local government, to local authorities and to Governors to see to it that law and order is maintained.

Law and order is essential for a free society, and I said publicly that civil wrongs do not make for civil rights. And violence in the streets is a great—it is a tragedy and it does a great disservice to the cause of civil liberties and civil rights and therefore law and order must be maintained and it must be sustained. And as you know, the President has ordered the Federal Bureau of Investigation to study whether or not there is any pattern here of these riots that are taking place. Does there seem to be a certain element, communistic or hoodlumism or gangsterism, or dope peddlers or Ku Kluxers or whatever it may be, that is trying to incite these riots. Because don't forget in Harlem for example, where you have 250,000 people living in an area of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  square miles, less than 1,000 were involved in the riots and I want to say for those fine citizens that went on with their daily lives and tried to maintain their sense of balance and decorum, that they deserve our praise.



## 98—RAC—L

John, do you know if the same density of population that you have in Harlem were applied to other areas of New York, you would be able to put the entire population of the United States of America in three boroughs in New York City. People are literally living on top of each other. Lack of education, sanitation, proper health protection, lack of jobs and training. Thousands of people uprooted from a rural background in the South and coming to the North into industrial areas. This, plus hoodlumism, this plus professional agitators, I think, has caused much of this rioting. It must be stopped, and I make an appeal now as I have before, that those who want to see America move ahead in the line of order and orderly development, must cooperate, must stop this sort of thing, and we will back up every law enforcement official in the country.

I don't think Mr. Goldwater is being particularly helpful, however, by saying that the Civil Rights Act breeds violence, hatred, and bitterness. I think we all ought to speak up for law observance. I think we ought to speak up for law and order. And when we see a Governor that does a good job or a mayor or a chief of police, let's help him, but at the same time let it be manifestly clear that President Johnson and Senator Hubert Humphrey—and I am sure Senator Goldwater and his running mate—believe that the laws must be enforced and that rioting and violence must stop.

Mr. ROLFSON. Senator, we are going to have to take another brief pause, but we will be back with more issues.

(Announcement.)

Mr. ANDERSON. Senator, you have always been a prime supporter of the Alliance for Progress in Latin America. There is some belief that the Alliance is not succeeding.

Is that true?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, Piers, of all the places that one can talk about the Alliance for Progress, the appropriate setting is here in New Mexico.

We are in an area of the world that has a background of Spanish culture. There is a large percentage of this population that is Spanish speaking and I happen to feel that this great Southwest can do a great deal to help the Alliance for Progress through its universities, its technicians, its technical schools, its agriculture.

The Alliance for Progress is making progress. I am very familiar with it, as you may know. I watch it very carefully and I am devoted to its fulfillment.



# Minnesota Historical Society

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

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



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