<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box Number</th>
<th>Folder Number</th>
<th>Document Date</th>
<th>No Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Document Type</th>
<th>Document Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7/5/1972</td>
<td></td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From Shumway to Strachan. RE: inexpensive travelling for campaign. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Author unknown. RE: the appointment of Clark MacGregor as campaign director. 6 pgs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7/10/1972</td>
<td></td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From Sedam to MacGregor. RE: Senator McGovern's campaign in a fourth party. 55 pgs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Number</td>
<td>Folder Number</td>
<td>Document Date</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Document Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7/11/1972</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From Joanou to Strachan. RE: campaign song status. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7/7/1972</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From Dean to Haldeman. RE: potential disruptions at the Democratic National Convention. 2 pgs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7/7/1972</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From Strachan to Cole. RE: Neustadt-Meet the Press. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6/27/1972</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Other Document</td>
<td>Author unknown. RE: event activites. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Number</td>
<td>Folder Number</td>
<td>Document Date</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Document Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7/10/1972</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Author unknown. RE: the Paulucci press conference. 7 pgs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Author unknown. RE: statement by Clark MacGregor. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7/18/1972</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From Khachigian to Strachan. RE: Abel Seconding speech. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Number</td>
<td>Folder Number</td>
<td>Document Date</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Document Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7/14/1972</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From Strachan to Malek. RE: the Yorty-Salvatori conflict. 2 pgs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7/20/1972</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Author unknown. RE: press release on the appointment of Sears in re-election campaign. 2 pgs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7/19/1972</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From Magruder to MacGregor. RE: Senator Dole. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7/20/1972</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From Dean to Haldeman. RE: potential disruptions at the 1972 Republican National Convention. 2 pgs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Number</td>
<td>Folder Number</td>
<td>Document Date</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Document Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7/21/1972</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Author unknown. RE: press release of ethnic groups organizing under Volpe and Derwinski. 2 pgs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7/28/1972</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From Chotiner to Haldeman. RE: response to letter from Demetracopolous. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7/22/1972</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Author unknown. RE: press release about reasons for vice president candidate Agnew. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7/22/1972</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Author unknown. RE: Bulen's statement about Agnew. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7/22/1972</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Author unknown. RE: MacGregor's support of Agnew. 2 pgs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Number</td>
<td>Folder Number</td>
<td>Document Date</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Document Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7/6/1972</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From Chapin to Magruder. RE: denouncing nomination of McGovern. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7/26/1972</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From Chotiner to Haldeman. RE: expose of Eagleton. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5/30/1972</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Author unknown. RE: McGovern's welfare plan. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5/30/1972</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Other Document</td>
<td>Text of Senator Humphrey's speech at the Biltmore Hotel. 5 pgs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Number</td>
<td>Folder Number</td>
<td>Document Date</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Document Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5/31/1972</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Author unknown. RE: flaws in McGovern giveaway scheme. 2 pgs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Author unknown. RE: investigation into McGovern's expenditure. 3 pgs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6/1/1972</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Author unknown. RE: Humphrey's tax loophole. 3 pgs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Author unknown. RE: campaign spending in California by McGovern. 2 pgs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6/2/1972</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Author unknown. RE: Kopp's support of Humphrey. 2 pgs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Number</td>
<td>Folder Number</td>
<td>Document Date</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Document Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6/2/1972</td>
<td></td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Author unknown. RE: Humphrey's job program. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6/2/1972</td>
<td></td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Author unknown. RE: McGovern not real friend of working families. 3 pgs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Number</td>
<td>Folder Number</td>
<td>Document Date</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Document Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6/5/1972</td>
<td></td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Author unknown. RE: Humphrey's differences from opponents. 2 pgs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6/5/1972</td>
<td></td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Author unknown. RE: jobs, difference in Humphrey campaign. 2 pgs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Number</td>
<td>Folder Number</td>
<td>Document Date</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Document Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Author unknown. RE: McGovern visiting Lindsay and Puerto Rico. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6/18/1972</td>
<td></td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Author unknown. RE: McGovern criticizing RN Israel policy. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6/18/1972</td>
<td></td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Author unknown. RE: statement by McGovern on RN campaign. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Author unknown. RE: rally for McGovern. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Number</td>
<td>Folder Number</td>
<td>Document Date</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Document Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Author unknown. RE: press schedule for McGovern. 2 pgs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6/18/1972</td>
<td></td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From Doughterty to public. RE: invitation to South Dakota for Lindsay. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Author unknown. RE: schedule of McGovern from New York to New Orleans. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From McGovern Press Office to Editors, News Directors, Assignments Desks. RE: Election Night Coverage and Credentials. 3 pgs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Number</td>
<td>Folder Number</td>
<td>Document Date</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Document Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Newsletter</td>
<td>Author unknown. RE: Labor Needs McGovern. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Newsletter</td>
<td>Author unknown. RE: McGovern for Safety on the Job. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Other Document</td>
<td>Author unknown. RE: McGovern Delegates and Alternates. 2 pgs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE, AM, FRIDAY, JULY 8, 1972

CONTACT: DeVan L. Shumway
202/333-7060
#7-3(8)

NORTH CAROLINA FINANCE CHAIRMAN

WASHINGTON -- Charlotte banking executive Patrick N. Calhoun will direct fund-raising activities in North Carolina for President Nixon's re-election campaign, according to Maurice Stans, chairman of the national Finance Committee to Re-elect the President.

Mr. Henry A. Mitchell, Jr., Raleigh attorney will serve as treasurer and legal counsel to the state finance committee. He served in a similar capacity in President Nixon's 1968 campaign.

Mr. Calhoun is executive vice president in charge of business development with the North Carolina National Bank.

A native of Atlanta, Georgia, and a graduate of Clemson University, he began his banking career in 1932 with the Guaranty Trust Company in New York. In 1955 he joined the Guilford National Bank in Greensboro as executive vice president, becoming president in 1958. Two years later he joined the North Carolina National Bank.

-30-
MEMORANDUM FOR: Gordon Strachan
FROM: DeVan Shumway

Jeb passed along your June 20 on Jack Anderson's column. We certainly will slip in our inexpensive travel in future stories or interviews -- but to raise the issue on our own would renew the financial reporting matter which would not be to our advantage.
WASHINGTON, JULY 1 -- Francis L. Dale, Chairman of the Committee for the Re-election of the President, announced today that John N. Mitchell has resigned as Campaign Director in order to devote more time to his wife and family. He will continue to serve the Committee in an advisory capacity.

"We have accepted John Mitchell's resignation with deep regret" Mr. Dale said, "but we are fortunate in the availability of a most distinguished successor. The new Campaign Director will be the Honorable Clark MacGregor, who is currently Counsel to the President for Congressional Relations.

Prior to his appointment by President Nixon in January 1971, Mr. MacGregor served with distinction as a Member of the House of Representatives for ten years from the 3rd District of Minnesota. He was a Member of the Judiciary Committee and the Committee on Banking and Currency."
June 30, 1972

Dear Mr. President:

Your words of friendship and understanding when we met today meant more to me than I can possibly convey in this letter. I have long believed and often said that nothing is more important to the future of our country than your re-election as President. I had looked forward eagerly to devoting all my time and energy to that result. I have found, however, that I can no longer do so on a full time basis and still meet the one obligation which must come first: the happiness and welfare of my wife and daughter. They have patiently put up with my long absences for some four years, and the moment has come when I must devote more time to them.

Relatively few men have the privilege of serving a President of the United States. In my case, the privilege has been special indeed, because I have admired so fully the wisdom and strength of your leadership.

As I said today, I shall continue to work for your re-election, and I shall always be grateful for your unfailing friendship and confidence.

Sincerely,

John N. Mitchell

The President
The White House
Washington, D.C.
July 1, 1972

Dear John:

I thoroughly understand and appreciate the compelling reasons for your decision to withdraw from full time political activity.

When you came to Washington, you made a most substantial sacrifice, personal and financial. However, in my twenty-six years of political life, I have often noted that the greater sacrifice is usually the wife's, since she must not only share the disappointments and the brickbats, but must accept the frequent absence of a husband and father. I am well aware that this has been particularly true of the Mitchell family, and I am most appreciative of the sacrifice Martha and you have both made in the service of the nation.

For my part, it is reassuring to know that your wise counsel will continue to be available, and I certainly shall call on you as your time will allow.

Pat joins me in sending our warmest regards to Martha, Marty, and to you.

Sincerely,
BIOGRAPHY

Clark MacGregor

Birth
Born in Minneapolis, Minnesota July 12, 1922, second son of William Edwin MacGregor and Edith Clark MacGregor.

Education
1937, graduated Bryant Junior High School, Minneapolis (awarded American Legion certificate as the outstanding graduate); June, 1940 graduated Washburn High School, Minneapolis as co-Valedictorian.

Awarded academic scholarships by Dartmouth, Yale, and Harvard; attended Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire, majoring in history and government. Following WW II military service, graduated cum laude from Dartmouth College in February, 1946.

Attended University of Minnesota Law School, graduating June, 1948 with J. D. degree.

Military

Family

Career
Associated with Snyder, Gale, Hoke, Richards and Janes, Minneapolis law firm, 1948-1952. Partner King and MacGregor, lawyers, Minneapolis, 1952-1961. Twelve years in general practice of law with developing emphasis on trial work.

Elected to the 87th Congress November 8, 1960 as the Republican Representative from the 3d District of Minnesota; re-elected to the 88th, 89th, 90th, and 91st Congresses. Member of the House Judiciary Committee January, 1961 to January, 1971. Member, House Committee on Banking and Currency, 1970.

Served as a member of the Select Committee of the House of Representatives on the seating of Adam Clayton Powell, January-March, 1967.

(cont.)
Appointed Counsel to the President for Congressional Relations January, 1971. Position entails work with Cabinet officers and senior White House staff members in translating Presidential ideas into legislative proposals. Helps to arrange the presentation of those proposals to the Congress with a view to creating the best possible favorable response; then supervises the effort to win Congressional approval. Presidential assignment of enlarging the scope of Presidential-Congressional cooperation and minimizing unproductive conflict.

Appointed member of President Nixon's Property Review Board October, 1971.

**Awards**


January 11, 1966, tribute as a member of the Legislative Branch who distinguished himself academically and athletically as an undergraduate, National Collegiate Athletic Association.


March 18, 1968, tribute for dedicated public service, nobility of purpose, and steadfast pursuit of legislation excellence in promoting the enduring interest of nation and state, and devotion to the dignity and rights of all men, Supreme Lodge, Order of AHEPA.


Member, Advisory Board of the Institute of American Strategy.

Member, Advisory Council for Radio Free Asia.

**Political Activity**

Elected by his Minnesota Republican colleagues as a member of the National Republican Congressional Campaign Committee, February, 1967.

1968 Midwest Nixon Chairman for nine-state area; selected by Mr. Nixon to be a member of the ten-man Surrogate group speaking for him around the Country; Deputy Chairman of the Nixon-Agnew Key Issues Committee; Assistant Floor Manager for Nixon at the Republican National Convention, Miami Beach, Florida, 1968.
Member, Executive Committee, Platform Committee, 1964
Republican National Convention, San Francisco, California.

Elected by his colleagues in 1965 as Chairman of the group of Republican Congressmen first elected to Congress in 1960.


As a former member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality, served as a U.S. Representative to the Intergovernmental Committee on European Migration meetings in Geneva, Switzerland. Traveled to Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Italy, Germany, Poland, Austria, Greece, Czechoslovakia, Israel, Vietnam, and the Continent of Africa on special assignments from the Committee to study refugee problems.

Defeated by Hubert H. Humphrey, November, 1970, in the Minnesota Senatorial election.

Legislation
Was a major author of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. Legislative leader in other crime control measures; in electoral college reform; in Congressional reorganization; in measures to establish high standards of ethical conduct for officials in all branches of government.

Was a major draftsman of the civil rights acts which passed the Congress in the decade of the '60's. Played a prominent role in the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Organizations
Active member of numerous Bar Association Committees and the American Judicature Society.

Extensive service 1948-1961 in United Fund campaigns, Big Brothers, Red Cross drives, and other civic endeavors. Member American Legion; Veterans of Foreign Wars; 101 Association (OSS) of World War II; Minnesota Alumni and Law Alumni Associations; Dartmouth Alumni Association; United Nations Association of the USA; National Advisory Committee of the John Wesley Educational and Development Foundation; National Board of Directors, Boys' Clubs of America; and American Clan Gregor Society.

Member, Chevy Chase Club and Capitol Hill Club, Washington, D.C. and Minneapolis Club and Wayzata Country Club, Minnesota.
MEMORANDUM

July 10, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR THE HONORABLE CLARK MAC GREGOR

THROUGH: JEB S. MAGRUDER

FROM: GLENN J. SEDAM, JR.

SUBJECT: SENATOR MCGOVERN'S OPPORTUNITIES AS A CANDIDATE OF A FOURTH PARTY

Senator McGovern does have available a hedge against an unsuccessful bid for the Democratic Party nomination. If the Senator does bolt the party, as he has threatened to do, he can step into the fourth party shell built over the past year by Dr. Benjamin Spock.

We have reviewed the laws of each of the fifty states of the United States, and the District of Columbia, in order to determine those states in which the People's Party, New Party, Peace & Freedom Party (Dr. Spock) will be on the ballot in November, to determine those states in which those parties will be precluded from being on the presidential ballot, and to determine further what steps must be taken in order to qualify on the ballot in those states in which it is still possible for them to qualify.

Further, we have reviewed the legal status of the People's Party, New Party, Peace & Freedom Party in each state, and have reviewed the requirements a minor or new party must meet in order to place its candidate on the general election ballot. We have also reviewed the requirements which must be met by an independent candidate to qualify for ballot inclusion.

As the attached material will indicate, Dr. Spock's fourth party has already obtained ballot position in the following four states:

Colorado
Idaho
Kentucky
New Jersey

A fourth party can not obtain ballot position in the following twelve states for in such states the final dates for filing have passed without the necessary filings having been made:

Arkansas
Georgia
Hawaii
Kansas
Maine
Maryland

Michigan
Nebraska
Ohio
Pennsylvania
Utah
West Virginia
In the remaining 35 states a fourth party can yet obtain ballot position; it can do so by petition in the following 29 states:

- Alaska
- Arizona
- Connecticut
- District of Columbia
- Florida
- Illinois
- Indiana
- Louisiana
- Massachusetts
- Minnesota
- Mississippi
- Missouri
- Montana
- Nevada
- New Hampshire
- New Mexico
- New York
- North Carolina
- North Dakota
- Oklahoma
- Rhode Island
- South Carolina
- South Dakota
- Tennessee
- Texas
- Vermont
- Virginia
- Wisconsin
- Wyoming

by convening a state or party convention or caucus in the following four states:

- Alabama
- California
- Delaware
- Washington

by either a convention or petition in the following two states:

- Iowa
- Oregon

In the above states where qualification is by convention generally compliance with state law would be merely procedural.

In the states which require petitions, acquiring the requisite number of signatures does not appear to present a serious obstacle to qualification in the following states:

- Iowa
- Louisiana
- Minnesota
- Mississippi
- New Hampshire
- North Dakota
- Rhode Island
- Tennessee
- Vermont
- Wisconsin
- Washington

Petitions are currently being circulated to acquire in New York, 20,000 signatures, and in Texas, 22,200 signatures. In Texas a three judge court
has been empaneled to review the filing deadline under Texas law, and pending that review, the deadline has been extended to September 1st. In Iowa administrative challenge to the validity of the selection of presidential electors and chairman at the Peace and Freedom Party Convention has not been determined.

Attached are analyses of each state and of the District of Columbia, constituting Exhibit A to this memorandum. Also attached, and constituting Exhibit B to this memorandum, is a tabulated breakdown of the basic information contained in the more detailed state-by-state survey. As to Exhibit B, it should be noted that in most instances where "new party" qualification is noted, Dr. Spock could also qualify as an "independent" candidate.
ALABAMA:

Dr. Spock can run as a candidate of a new party, provided he timely filed a notice of intention to run. No candidate may appear on the ballot who has not by March 1 filed a declaration of intention of becoming a candidate, except candidates filling vacancies as party nominees. The Secretary of State of Alabama declines to advise as to candidates filing a declaration of intention.

Any political party or "faction" can nominate candidates by holding a state convention and by certifying its candidates to the Secretary of State sixty days (September 9, 1972) prior to the election.

An independent candidate may obtain a place on the ballot by filing a petition signed by 300 qualified voters no later than the first Tuesday in May. No independent petitions were filed prior to the filing deadline.

Statute: 17 Code of Ala., § 145.
ALASKA:

Dr. Spock can run as a new party or independent candidate. A new party or independent candidate may be nominated by a petition signed by voters equal to three percent (2,547) of the votes cast in the preceding presidential election, which petition must be filed with the Lt. Governor ninety days (August 10, 1972) prior to the general election.

Statute: Alaska Stat. §§ 15.1.60, 15.25.150, 15.30.025 and 15.60.010.
ARIZONA:

Dr. Spock can run as a candidate of a new party provided that:

(1) He does not run in any primary election. There is a statutory prohibition against a candidate running as an independent (including new party) candidate if he ran in a primary. Primaries are scheduled for September 12, 1972;

(2) He files with the Secretary of State by July 14, 1972 a petition signed by a number of qualified voters equal to one percent of the vote cast for governor in the last general election. All of these signatories must be persons who do not vote for a candidate for the office in question in the primary election and who have not signed another independent petition for such office.

An independent candidate must file with the Secretary of State a petition signed by a number of voters equal to at least 2% of the number of votes cast for governor in the last general election. Such petition must be filed by July 14, 1972, which is at least sixty days and no more than ninety days prior to the state primary election.

ARKANSAS:

Dr. Spock cannot run in Arkansas, as all applicable deadlines have passed.

A new political party may obtain a place on the ballot by filing with the Secretary of State a petition signed by a number of qualified voters equal to at least seven percent of the total vote cast at the last general election for governor or presidential electors. The petition must be filed at least thirty days (May 19, 1972) prior to 12 o'clock noon of the third Tuesday of June (June 20, 1972) before the general election in which the party wishes to participate. The American Independent Party is the only new party qualifying by the prescribed deadline.

Statute: A.S.A. §§ 3-101(a), 3-105(c), 3-207, 3-113 and 3-121.
Dr. Spock can run as a candidate of the Peace and Freedom Party, which is a recognized party in California. The California statute apparently does not provide for a cutoff date by which candidates of recognized parties must be certified to the Secretary of State, it being assumed that such certification will proceed immediately following the parties' conventions.

A new party can be created in one of three ways:

1. By having a group place an independent candidate on the ballot for the office of Governor, which candidate receives two percent or more of the vote; or

2. As of the 135th day preceding the election in which the party wishes to run a candidate, have a registration in such new party equal to one percent of the votes cast for Governor in the last election; or

3. Prior to the 135th day preceding the election submit a petition signed by qualified voters equal to at least ten percent of the total vote for Governor in the last gubernatorial election.

An independent candidate may obtain a place on the ballot by filing a nomination petition signed by a number of voters equal to at least five percent of the entire vote cast in the last statewide election, which could as a practical matter be very difficult to get. Each nomination petition must
be left with the county clerk of the county of registration of the voters who sign it for examination not more than eighty-four nor less than sixty days before the election in which the candidate desires to participate, and must be filed with the Secretary of State no more than seventy-nine nor less than fifty-four days before such election. The independent candidate must not have been defeated as a candidate for the office in question at the primary election, no signatory of such nomination petition(s) may have voted with respect to such office in the primary. Such candidate is not allowed to have been affiliated with a political party qualified to participate in a primary election at the last preceding primary.

COLORADO:

Dr. Spock can run as a candidate of the People's Party which has qualified by petition.

A new party or an independent candidate can qualify by filing a petition containing at least 300 signatures at least forty-five days (September 24, 1971) prior to the election.

Statute: C.R. S. Ch. 49-7-1.
CONNECTICUT:

Dr. Spock can run as an independent candidate by filing a petition containing that number of signatures of voters equal to at least 1% (12,746) of the votes cast for presidential electors at the last presidential election. Such petition must be filed at least nine weeks (September 5, 1972) prior to the election.


Current: June 26, 1972: No indication intends to qualify.
DELAWARE:

Dr. Spock can run as a candidate of a new party.

A new party must:

(1) Elect delegates to a national convention (although there is no requirement that such delegates attend or be seated at such convention, or that the national convention be of the new party).

(2) Hold a state convention no later than July 22, 1972, the fourth Saturday in July, at which it elects a state committee and nominates candidates for all elected positions to be voted on a statewide basis at the next general election.

(3) Certify its nominees to the Secretary of State no later than September 1, 1972.

Delaware does not permit independent nominations.

Statute: D.C. A. Tit. 15 §§ 101, 3301(a), 3303.
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:

Dr. Spock can run as a new party candidate or as an independent candidate.

A new party must submit its name to the Elections Board for approval. If approved, it would then be required to file by August 15th a petition signed by five percent of the registered voters in the District of Columbia as of July 1, 1972 (approximately 13,000 signatures).

An independent would proceed by petition as above.

Statute: District of Columbia Code, § 1-1108.
FLORIDA:

Dr. Spock can run as a new party candidate. A new party must file a petition containing signatures of qualified voters equal to at least one percent of the votes cast at the last general election. A separate petition shall be submitted from each county from which signatures are solicited and each petition shall be submitted to the supervisor of elections of the respective county no later than August 15, 1972.

There is no provision for independent candidates for presidential electors.

Statute: F.S.A. § 103.021(3).
GEORGIA:

Dr. Spock cannot run in Georgia as all applicable deadlines have passed.

A new party must have held a convention by May 9, 1972 and must have filed a petition containing signatures of qualified voters supporting that party equal to at least five percent (98,022) of the total number of voters eligible to vote in the state in the last presidential election. The petition must be filed in the office of the Secretary of State by 12 noon, June 14, 1972. Such party must have filed with its petition the minutes of its nominating convention, which must have been held by May 9, 1972.

An independent candidate must have filed a petition with the same number of signatures (98,022) as required for a new party, as outlined above, which must be filed prior to 12 noon, June 14, 1972.

Statute: G.C.A. Ch. 34 §§ 901, 902 and 903.
HAWAII:

Dr. Spock cannot run in Hawaii as all applicable deadlines have passed.

A new party or independent candidate must have filed by June 9, 1972, 120 days prior to the general election, a petition signed by one percent of the registered voters of the state.

IDAHO:

Dr. Spock can run as a candidate of the Peace & Freedom Party which has qualified by petition.

There is a requirement in Idaho that a party convention must be held by June 30th and certify its nominees to the Secretary of State immediately thereafter. However, the office of the Secretary of State believes that failure to do so would not bar a candidate of a recognized party from running. This point has not yet been challenged or resolved.

A new party may qualify by filing a petition with the signatures of 1,500 qualified voters stating their desire for recognition of such party, which petition must be filed thirty days (May 30, 1972) prior to the June 30 preceding election. It too, would then be required to hold a convention by June 30.

Only political parties may nominate presidential electors.

Statute: I.A.C. Ch. 6, §§ 34-711 and 34-501.
ILLINOIS:

Dr. Spock can run as an independent or new party candidate by filing a petition with the Secretary of State and signed by at least 25,000 qualified voters of whom 200 must be from each of at least 50 counties within the State. This petition must be filed between July 31 and August 7, 1972.

Statute: S.H.A., Ch. 46, §§ 10-2, 10-3 and 10-6.
INDIANA:

Dr. Spock can run as an independent or a new party candidate by filing a petition with the Secretary of State by September 1, 1972. The petition must contain signatures of qualified voters equal to at least one-half of one percent (approximately 8,500) of all the votes cast in the last general election for the office of Secretary of State.

IOWA:

Dr. Spock can run as a new party or independent candidate.

A new party may nominate a candidate for statewide elective office by means of a statewide caucus attended by 250 qualified voters with at least one voter from each of 25 counties of the state. This nomination must then be certified to the Secretary of State between August 14 and September 3, 1972.

In addition to statewide caucus, a candidate may also be nominated by a petition signed by 1,000 qualified voters and filed with the Secretary of State between August 14 and September 3, 1972.

Statute: 4 I.C.A. §§ 43.2, 44.1 and 45.1.
KANSAS:

Dr. Spock cannot run in Kansas, the applicable deadlines having passed.

A new political party can nominate by convention but to establish itself must file a petition sixty days before June 20 (April 20) with the Secretary of State signed by a number of voters equal to at least five percent of the number of votes cast for governor in the last gubernatorial election. No new party filed prior to the April 20 deadline.

Only recognized political parties may nominate presidential electors. Kansas has four such parties: Republican, Democrat, Conservative and Prohibition.

KENTUCKY:

Dr. Spock can run as a candidate of the Peoples Party and he has been so nominated.

A new party can obtain a place on the ballot by filing a petition signed by at least 4,000 qualified voters by the 59th day (March 29, 1972) prior to the primary. By March 29, 1972 the following parties had filed: Peoples Party, American Party, Communist Party, Socialist Labor Party and Freedom Party.

There is no provision in Kentucky for an "independent" slate of electors.

Statute: K.R.S.A., §§ 118.010, 118.080, 118.090 and 118.130.
LOUISIANA:

Dr. Spock can run as a candidate of a new party or as an independent.

An independent candidate for presidential elector may be nominated by petition signed by at least 1,000 qualified voters. The petition must be certified by the registrar of each parish in which a signatory claims to be a qualified voter and must be filed with the Secretary of State on or before September 30, 1972, the date of the second primary election.

A new party may obtain a place on the ballot by means of a similar petition signed by 1,000 electors and filing a list of the candidates to be run by such party with the Secretary of State not later than September 19, 1972, the seventh Tuesday prior to the election.

MAINE:

Dr. Spock cannot run in Maine as all applicable filing dates have passed.

An independent or new party candidate can qualify by petition signed by qualified voters equal in number to at least one percent (3,254) of the votes cast for governor in the last general election. The petition must be filed with the Secretary of State by 9 P.M. on primary day, June 19, 1972.

MARYLAND:

Dr. Spock cannot run as no certificate of candidacy was timely filed.

Minor party, new party and independent certificates of candidacy needed to be filed by March 6, 1972.

MASSACHUSETTS:

Dr. Spock can run as a new party or independent candidate.

An independent candidate or a new party may qualify for the ballot by filing a petition signed by at least that number of qualified voters equal to three percent (56,038) of the votes cast in the last gubernatorial election, not more than 1/3 of which signatories are voters from any one county. The nomination papers must be submitted to the registrar of the city or town where the voter signing purports to be registered, prior to 5 P.M. on July 5, 1972, the seventh day preceding the date on which it must be filed with the Secretary of State for certification. Certified nomination papers must be filed with the Secretary of State with the candidates' written acceptances on or before July 11, 1972, the 17th Tuesday preceding the date of the election. Objections to nomination papers must be filed with the Secretary of State at least 72 "week day hours" succeeding 5 P.M. of the last day for filing the papers.

Statute: Mass. Law Ann., Ch. 50, § 1, Ch. 53, §§ 6, 7, 9, 10 and 11.
MICHIGAN:

Dr. Spock cannot run in Michigan as all applicable deadlines have passed.

A new party can qualify by filing a petition containing signatures of qualified voters equal to between one percent and three percent of the last vote for Secretary of State. A number of parties did so file, but there is no indication Dr. Spock is connected with any of them.

There is no statutory provision for independent candidates in Michigan.

Statute: M.C.L.A. § 1685.
MINNESOTA:

Dr. Spock can run as a candidate of a new party or as an independent.

A new party or an independent candidate may be nominated by a petition signed by a number of voters equal to one percent of the total votes cast at the last general election, or by 2,000 voters, whichever is less. The petition must be filed with the Secretary of State between July 5 and September 12, 1972.

MISSISSIPPI:

Dr. Spock can run as a candidate of a new party or as an independent by filing a petition by September 27, 1972, forty days preceding the election, containing signatures of 1,000 qualified voters.

Statute: M.C.A., Tit. 14, §§ 3107, 3260.
MISSOURI:

Dr. Spock can run as a candidate of a new party or as an independent by filing not later than July 31 with the Secretary of State a petition signed in the aggregate (i) by a number of qualified voters in each of the several congressional districts which shall equal one percent of the total number of votes cast in such district for governor at the last election, or (ii) by a number of qualified voters in each of one-half of the several congressional districts which shall equal two percent of the total number of votes cast in those districts for governor in the last election.

Dr. Spock can run as a candidate of a new party or as an independent.

Any new political party and any independent candidate may obtain a place on the ballot by filing a certificate of nomination with the Secretary of State by August 9, 1972, ninety days before the date of the general election. This certificate must have the signatures of qualified voters equal to at least five percent of the votes cast for the successful candidate for the same office at the last applicable general election.

NEBRASKA:

Dr. Spock cannot run in Nebraska. The Secretary of State will accept candidate certification for presidential electors only from the Republican and Democrat national convention as the February 9, 1972 deadline for new party and independent petitions passed with no petitions submitted.

NEVADA:

Dr. Spock can run as a new party or independent candidate by filing a petition containing signatures of that number of qualified voters equal to five percent (6,882) of the total vote for Representative in Congress in the preceding election. A new party petition must be filed no later than July 7, 1972, which is sixty days preceding the September 5, 1972 primary.

An independent petition must be filed no later than July 14, 1972, the second Friday in July.

Statute: N.R.S. §§ 293.073, 293.128 and 293.200.
NEW HAMPshire:

Dr. Spock can run as a candidate of a new party or as an independent.

New party or independent nominations must be made by petition signed by at least 1,000 qualified voters and filed with the Secretary of State by September 27, 1972.

NEW JERSEY:

Dr. Spock can run as a candidate of the Peoples Party, and it is expected that he will be so nominated by that party. The Peoples Party is not recognized as a third party in New Jersey, but has qualified for the ballot for the November 1972 election by filing a petition signed by 800 qualified voters as to each candidate nominated in the petition, which petition must have been filed by April 27, 1972, the fortieth day prior to the primary election.

New party candidates or independent candidates would qualify by petition as above. The only groups so qualifying for the November 1972 election were: American Party, Socialist Labor Party, Socialist Worker's Party, Communist Party, America First and Peoples Party. All but the Peoples Party have as of June 26, 1972 made such designations. The Peoples Party must designate by October 4, 1972.

NEW MEXICO:

Dr. Spock can run as a candidate of a new party.

To become a qualified political party an organization need only adopt rules and make various filings, but there is no number of voters or petitioners necessary. Such rules must be filed with the Secretary of State within thirty days of the party's organization and at least sixty days (September 8, 1972) prior to any election in which it may participate. Such party must then certify its candidates to the Secretary of State by September 12, 1972 (fifty-seven days preceding the election), such certification accompanied by a petition of support signed by a number of voters equal to at least three percent of the last vote for governor.


Statute: N.M.S.A., Ch. 3-7-2 et seq., 3-8-2, 3-11-11, 3-12-2, 3-12-3 and 3-15-3.
NEW YORK:

Dr. Spock can run as an independent candidate by filing a petition between August 28 and 31 containing signatures of at least 20,000 qualified voters, of which at least 100 must be voters in one-half of the state's congressional districts.

In order to become a recognized party in New York it is necessary to run an independent candidate for governor, which candidate receives at least 50,000 votes. The only recognized parties in New York are the Republican, Democrat, Conservative and Liberal.

Statute:  McKinney's Election Law, §§ 2, 133, 138, 143(8) and 149a.

Current:

June 26, 1972: The requirement that independent petitions be signed by at least 100 voters in one-half of the congressional districts is currently being challenged in court.

There are indications that the Peoples Party is circulating petitions.
NORTH CAROLINA:

Dr. Spock can run as a candidate of a new party or as an independent.

A new party may nominate presidential electors by filing a petition signed by at least 10,000 qualified voters. As to filing date, see below.

An independent candidate for presidential elector must submit a petition signed by 25% of the combined votes for all presidential candidates in the last election, which would mean approximately 325,000 signatures. As to filing date, see below.

The filing and other dates are extremely flexible in North Carolina, particularly as the State Board of Elections had considerable authority to vary and extend deadlines. Conversations with the Board indicate that the deadline for petitions and conventions is generally set to be in July, but the Board automatically holds up the deadline to accommodate the Republican and Democrat Conventions parties, and will wherever possible extend deadlines for new parties and independents who are making a valid effort to obtain ballot status.

Statute: N.C.S. Ch. 163-96(1), 163-96(2), 163-122 and 163-208 et seq.
NORTH DAKOTA:

Dr. Spock can run as a candidate of a new party or as an independent by filing a petition signed by at least 300 qualified voters, which petition must be filed forty days (September 29, 1972) prior to the election.

There are no third parties recognized in North Dakota.

Statute: N.D.C.A., Ch. 16-03-01 et seq.
OHIO:

Dr. Spock cannot run in Ohio, all applicable filing dates have passed.

A new party can have its candidate on the ballot if it files a petition signed by a number of qualified voters equal to at least one percent of the total vote at the last general election for governor or for presidential electors.

Independent candidates for presidential electors are nominated by petition signed by at least 5,000 but not more than 15,000 registered voters.

Such petitions must be filed with the Secretary of State by 4 P.M., April 20, 1972, the 19th day before the 1st Tuesday after the 1st Monday in May preceding the election.

The only recognized third parties are the American Independent Party and the Socialist Labor Party.

Dr. Spock can run as a candidate of a new party. A new political party may obtain a place on the ballot by filing a petition containing the signatures of 5,000 qualified voters. There is no time limit as a matter of law as to when such petition is to be filed. After filing the petition, together with a loyalty oath, the Secretary of State can then determine as a matter of his discretion whether to allow such party on the ballot. (This discretion provision was recently upheld by the Oklahoma Supreme Court.) Only political parties may nominate presidential electors. The only third party recognized is the American Party.

OREGON:

Dr. Spock can run as a candidate of a new party or as an independent.

In order to be recognized a new party must either:

(1) Convene a statewide meeting of at least 1,000 qualified voters and file a Certificate of Nomination on or before August 29, 1972; or

(2) File prior to August 29, 1972 a petition containing signatures of voters equivalent to five percent of the entire vote cast in the last presidential election.

Independent candidates must file a Nomination Petition with signatures equivalent to not less than three percent of the entire vote cast in the last general election, plus a list of six presidential electors prior to August 29, 1972; or convene an Assembly of Electors attended by at least 1,000 qualified voters which Assembly must certify its candidates prior to August 29, 1972.

Statute: O.R.S. Ch. 248.010(b), 249.710 et seq., 249.770.
PENNSYLVANIA:

Dr. Spock cannot run in Pennsylvania, as all applicable filing dates have passed.

A new "party" or an independent candidate can qualify for the ballot by filing a petition by March 8, 1972 signed by at least a number of qualified voters equal to two percent (approximately 36,000) of the largest statewide vote in the last general election. Only the Communist Party so qualified.

Statute: 25 P.S. §§ 2831, 2911 and 2913.
RHODE ISLAND:

Dr. Spock can run as an independent candidate by filing a petition containing signatures of at least 500 qualified voters at least 45 days (July 28, 1972) prior to the September 12, 1972 primary. Nominating petitions must be secured from the Secretary of State during the last ten days of June.

There are no third parties qualified in Rhode Island. To qualify as a party it is necessary to run an independent gubernatorial candidate who then receives at least five percent of the vote for governor.

Statute: R.I. Gen. L. Ann., Tit. 17-1-2(s) and 17-16-1 et seq.
SOUTH CAROLINA:

Dr. Spock can run as a candidate of a new party or as an independent by filing a petition containing signatures of at least 10,000 qualified voters by September 8, 1972, at least sixty days prior to the election.

Statute: S.C.C.A. Tit. 23-2(7) and 23-400.16.
SOUTH DAKOTA:

Dr. Spock can run as an independent candidate. Only the Republican and Democrat parties are recognized in South Dakota.

An independent can be nominated by filing a petition signed by qualified voters equal to at least two percent of the number of votes cast in the last gubernatorial election which petition must be filed at least sixty-five days (September 2, 1972) before the general election.

A new political party may be formed by filing a notice with the Secretary of State signed by a number of qualified voters equal to ten percent of the number of voters who cast ballots in the last gubernatorial election. The certificate must be filed forty days before the primary which was held on June 6, 1972, the first Tuesday in June. No new party qualified by the prescribed deadline.

Statute: 42 S.D.C.L. 12-1-3(3), 12-5-1, 12-7-1 and 12-8-6.
TENNESSEE:

Dr. Spock can run as a candidate of a new party or as an independent.

A new political party can be formed by filing a petition signed by that number of qualified voters equal to at least five percent of the number of votes cast in the last presidential election. The petition must be filed prior to 12 o'clock noon on September 7, 1972, the first Thursday in September.

An independent candidate may gain a place on the ballot by petition signed by the candidate and twenty-five qualified voters, which petition is filed before the first Thursday in June if the candidacy is for a primary or the first Thursday in September if the candidacy is for a general election.

Statute: T.C. Ann., Tit. 2-1205 and 2-1206.
UTAH:

Dr. Spock cannot run in Utah, all applicable filing dates having passed.

To have qualified as a new party a group must have filed, by March 15, 1972, a petition signed by at least 500 qualified voters, of whom at least ten are from each of ten different counties of the State. Such party must then have held the required organizing convention prior to April 15, 1972. The American Independent Party is the only new party qualifying for the November 1972 election.

No independent nominees for presidential electors are permitted.

Statute: U.C. Ann., Tit. 20-3-1 et seq.
VERMONT:

Dr. Spock can run as a new party candidate or as an independent by filing a certificate of nomination signed by voters residing in the state equal in number to one percent (1,535) of the entire vote cast for governor in the preceding general election. The certificate of nomination shall be filed with the Secretary of State by September 20, 1972, which is no more than sixty days nor less than forty-seven days before the day of the general election.

Statute: V.S.A., Tit. 17, §§ 331, 571, 573 and 577.

Current:

June 26, 1972: No indication of new party or independent petition activity except by Socialist Worker's Party.

The Liberty Union Party -- a McGovern group -- is a recognized minor party and may nominate by convention.
VIRGINIA:

Dr. Spock can run as a candidate of a new party (as noted below) or as an independent.

A new political party can be formed by (i) establishing a state committee at least six months prior to filing its petition (below); (ii) filing a petition signed by one-half of one percent (9,105) of the state's qualified voters as of the preceding January 1. Petitions must be filed by 12 o'clock noon, September 8, 1972.

An independent slate of electors need only file the petition as above.

TEXAS:

Dr. Spock can run as a candidate of the Peoples Party, which although not a recognized party in Texas, has filed the required Notice of Intent to Run prior to the November 7, 1971 deadline. The Peoples Party must file a petition signed by qualified voters equal to at least one percent (22,300) of the total vote for governor in the last gubernatorial election. Petitions can circulate only between June 3 and July 2, by the latter date they must be filed with the Secretary of State. Thereafter on September 19, 1972, the party must have a convention.

Independent candidates need only submit the petition as described above, but must have submitted a Notice of Intent to run prior to February 7, 1972.


Current:

June 26, 1972: The Peoples Party has duly filed its Notice of Intent and is currently circulating petitions.
WASHINGTON:

Dr. Spock can run as a new ("Minor") party candidate. Only the Republican and Democrat parties are recognized ("Major") parties in Washington.

A new ("Minor") party can obtain a place on the ballot by holding a convention on primary day (September 19, 1972 -- third Tuesday in September) attended (and file, by September 26, 1972, a certificate of nomination signed by) at least 100 registered voters, or at least ten registered voters from each of the seven congressional districts in the state, who did not vote at the primary election held on that day.

Washington law has no provision for independent candidates for presidential electors.

WEST VIRGINIA:

Dr. Spock cannot run in West Virginia. No third parties or independent presidential electors have qualified for the November 1972 election, and all applicable filing dates have passed.

WYOMING:

Dr. Spock can run as an independent candidate by filing a petition prior to September 27, 1972 containing signatures of qualified voters equal to at least five percent (5,915) of the total vote cast for Representative in Congress at the last general election.

There are no third parties recognized in Wyoming and to qualify as a new party it is necessary to run an independent candidate for Representative in Congress, which candidate receives at least ten percent of the vote cast.

WISCONSIN:

Dr. Spock can run as an independent candidate.

Independent candidates can secure a place on the ballot by filing a petition containing signatures of at least 3,000 but not more than 5,000 qualified voters, which filing must be made by September 19, 1972.

Only the American Party qualified as a new party by the June 1, 1972 deadline for new parties.

Statute: W.S.A. §§ 5.62 and 8.20.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>CAN.</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ala.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>new party</td>
<td>Declaration (see text) and convention</td>
<td>9/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alas.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>new party</td>
<td>Petition: 2,547 sgs.</td>
<td>8/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariz.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>new party</td>
<td>Petition: 17 last vote</td>
<td>7/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ark.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>All applicable filing dates passed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom Certification</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cola.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Peoples Party</td>
<td>Already qualified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conn.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Independent Convention</td>
<td>Petition: 12,746 sgs.</td>
<td>9/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>new party</td>
<td>Convention and certify 9/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fl.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>new party</td>
<td>Petition: 13,000 sgs. 9/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>new party</td>
<td>Petition: 17 last vote</td>
<td>8/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>All applicable filing dates passed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iow.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom Convention</td>
<td>6/30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ill.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>new party</td>
<td>Petition: 25,000 sgs. 7/31-8/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>new party</td>
<td>Petition: 8,900 sgs. 9/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>new party</td>
<td>Convention or petition: 1,000 sigs. 8/4-9/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>All applicable filing dates passed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Peoples Party</td>
<td>Already qualified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>new party; Independents</td>
<td>Petition: 1,000 sgs. 9/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>All applicable filing dates passed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Certificate of Candidacy Filed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DR. STOCK**

**STATUS REPORT:** 6/26/72

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass.</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>new party</th>
<th>Petition:</th>
<th>7/5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mich.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>All applicable filing dates passed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minn.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>new party</td>
<td>Petition: 2,680 sgs. 7/5-9/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>new party</td>
<td>Petition: 1,000 sgs. 9/27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>new party</td>
<td>Petition: (See text) 7/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mont.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>new party</td>
<td>Petition: 8/9 5% of last vote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neb.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>All applicable filing dates passed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nev.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>new party</td>
<td>Petition: 6,882 sgs. 7/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.H.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>new party</td>
<td>Petition: 1,000 sgs. 9/27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.J.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Peoples Party</td>
<td>Already qualified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.M.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>new party</td>
<td>Petition: 9/2 File rules (See text)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Y.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>Petition: 8/28-31 20,000 sgs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>new party</td>
<td>Petition: (See text) 10,000 sgs. 9/29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>new party</td>
<td>Petition: 300 sgs. 9/29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>All applicable filing dates passed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okla.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>new party</td>
<td>Petition: Open 5,000 sgs. (See text)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oreg.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>new party</td>
<td>Petition: 8/29 5% of last vote or convention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>All applicable filing dates passed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.I.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>Petition: 500 sgs. 7/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>new party</td>
<td>Petition: 10,000 sgs. 9/8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>Petition: 5/2 25 prior votes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenn.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>new party</td>
<td>Petition: 9/7 5% last vote 500 sgs. 9/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tex.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Peoples Party</td>
<td>Petition: 22,300 sgs. and convention 9/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>All applicable filing dates passed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vt.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>new party</td>
<td>Petition: 1,535 sgs.</td>
<td>9/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Va.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>new party</td>
<td>Petition: 9,105 sgs. (See text)</td>
<td>9/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Va.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>new party</td>
<td>Convention and petition: 100 sgs.</td>
<td>9/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisc.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>Petition: 3,000 sgs.</td>
<td>9/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyo.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>Petition: 5,815 sgs.</td>
<td>9/27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

July 11, 1972

TO: GORDON STRACHAN
FROM: PHIL JOANOU
SUBJECT: Campaign Song Status

We currently have four song writer teams working on the campaign song. From this, two or more options will be available for review the week of July 17. Selection of recording artist will depend upon the final selection of the song.

cc: Pete Dailey
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON
July 7, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALEYMAN
FROM: JOHN DEAN
SUBJECT: Potential Disruptions at the Democratic National Convention

This is to serve as an update to our report of June 30 on the above subject. Basically, there have been no significant changes during this past week, and the convention is still not expected to attract large numbers of demonstrators. To date, no public transportation has been reported to carry protesters to Miami Beach.

The previously reported convention planned by the National Welfare Rights Organization (NWRO) does not seem to be attracting as large a number as had been anticipated. Currently, 2,000 participants are claimed to have registered, but the actual number in attendance appears to be far less. The other organizations planning to demonstrate generally have failed to coordinate protest activities, which should tend to lessen their impact. A tentative list of demonstrations scheduled for the week is attached for your information.

Except for the Vietnam Veterans Against the War (VVAW) and the ZIPPIE faction of the Youth International Party, all groups have stressed an intention to remain peaceful during the convention. However, the VVAW and ZIPPIES, neither of which can be controlled by other protest leaders, will probably attempt to create confrontations with police.

Spokesmen for the Cuban exile group, Asociacion de Veteranos de Bahia de Cochinos, Brigade 506, have requested authorization for 2,000 Cubans to demonstrate on July 10 and 15 in favor of the present Administration. If permission is not granted, its leaders claim that Cuban workers in hotels in Miami Beach will go on strike during the convention. Other Cuban groups have also announced plans to stage protests against any plank in the Democratic platform favoring negotiations with Castro. Therefore, the potential for confrontations between demonstrators and Cuban counter-demonstrators remains high.
DEMONSTRATIONS SCHEDULED FOR THE
DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

July 8
Youth International Party
Senior Citizens Rally
7:00 p.m., Flamingo Park, Miami Beach

National Tenants Organization
Rally, 4:00 p.m., Convention Center

Workers Action Movement
Picket various hotels

July 9
ZIP (Zippets)
Marijuana Smoke-in
Bay Shore Golf Course, Miami Beach

Workers Action Movement
Picket various hotels

Southern Christian Leadership Conference
Rally, Manor Park, Miami

July 10-14
Cuban refugee groups
Demonstrations, Convention Center

July 10
National Welfare Rights Organization
March, 7-10:00 p.m.
Flamingo Park to Convention Center

July 11
Students for a Democratic Society
March to Convention Hall, 4:30 p.m.

Gay Liberation Front
Demonstration, Convention Hall

July 12
Gay Activist Alliance
"Kiss-in," Convention Center
You probably noticed that the Democratic Chairman of the Platform Committee stated on Meet the Press that the Democrat's three big issues will be joblessness, Vietnam and health care. The first two are beyond our control, but are you working with Jim Cavanaugh and others on the Domestic Council to position us correctly on health care?

Just a thought.
MAMI BEACH—Richard Nixon and George McGovern enter the election campaign with fascinatingly different concepts of the 1972 American electorate. And those different concepts dictate contrasting strategies.

Sen. McGovern, crowned by the new forces in his party as the Democratic nominee last night, basically believes that "a new constituency for change" will elect him President.

He sees this constituency as essentially a nonideological conglomerate of individual voters, wed up with failures of government and the whole "system" rather than a liberal constituency yearning for his sweeping income-redistribution scheme and other very liberal programs.

Thus Sen. McGovern will strive to build an image of a candidate who can be trusted to carry out fundamental change. And he will try to attract discontented voters from all economic and social classes, whether or not they agree with all his specific prescriptions for change. (For an assessment of Mr. McGovern's chances this fall, see Vermont Royster's column on the editorial page.)

The Nixon Concept

The Nixon concept, in sharp contrast, now has become essentially the traditional Democratic view of the electorate as composed of disparate voting blocs. So the President will try to put together an assemblage of Catholics, Jews, Southern white Protestants and Mexican-Americans atop the traditional small Republican base and thus build a majority. Significantly, the President is using the power of his office to cultivate the special interests of these groups, just as Democratic Presidents have done since Franklin Roosevelt.

Thus, the President promises Catholics aid to parochial schools, opposes liberal abortion laws and takes Philadelphia's John Cardinal Krol for a midnight cruise on the Potomac. Mr. Nixon assures Jews that Israel will never fall to the Arabs while he is President. He promises education to school boards and appoints conservatives to the Supreme Court to please white Southerners. He names 50 Spanish-surnamed persons to high government jobs, and federal agencies offer a special $12 million fund for Chicano projects between now and the election.

At least in part, the contrasting concepts and strategies result from the differences between being in and out of office. Mr. Nixon, as the power holder, can actually target federal programs on voting blocs. Mr. McGovern, the power seeker, can only make promises. And—just as candidate Nixon offered himself in 1968 as the spokesman for a "silent American" majority dissatisfied with Democratic government—the office seeker always poses as the standard-bearer of a majority that wants to throw out the incumbent.

A Fundamental Conflict

After allowances for rhetorical necessities, however, there remain fundamentally conflicting analyses of the electorate in the McGovern and Nixon camps. Indeed, the youthful McGovern strategists are contemptuous of the old Democratic voting-bloc tactics that the Republican President has adopted.

"Nixon people don't understand the country," asserts Pat Caddell, the Senator's 21-year-old pollster, who graduated from Harvard last month. "You can't reach blocs of voters in the traditional ways any more. Like Nixon is trying to do. People are too smart for that. They recognize the political motives, and that's what they're sick of—the same old politics."

Older hands in the McGovern organization, including the Senator himself, don't entirely dismiss the importance of counting the old bloc votes. Indeed, after becoming assured of the nomination Monday night, Mr. McGovern immediately made a play for the Jewish vote with a new platform plank stressing military aid to Israel. With an eye on the Catholic vote, he is seriously weighing the selection of a Catholic running mate. And he is relying on holding the black vote that has been heavily Democratic.

Emphasis on "Mood"

Fundamentally, though, McGovern men agree with the Caddell analysis that traditional courting of bloc votes no longer counts for much. "This isn't going to be an election that turns on personalities or programs but one that turns on 'mood.'" says Fred Dutton, a veteran political operative, who advises Sen. McGovern. And the concept that the mood of a new type of majority favors basic change is central to Sen. McGovern's candidacy, he adds.

The Senator himself views his constituency this way: "It is the people who have been passed by in American life and are frustrated that they have not had a voice in bringing about the changes that they think would improve their lives. This is a coalition of change, a coalition of conscience, a coalition of progress. It is against the status quo, and I think it represents a majority of the American people."

In this view, dissatisfaction of Americans with things as they are is so strong that it has created a political upheaval in the electorate comparable to the unrest generated in the Depression era. What a majority wants more than anything else, the McGovern men believe, is a President who can be trusted. And in their obviously biased view, an image of that is the Senator's strong suit against President Nixon.

Thus, while the McGovern organization wants the support of labor leaders, it isn't relying on union officials to deliver votes to the Senator because he embraces the old Democratic bread-and-butter programs. Working people, like others, are "tired of institutions and the government," and "they want change," says Carl Wagner, the Senator's labor aide. "Most of all, they want a guy who will level
with them," he adds, and "George McGovern will do that."

This concept of the electorate is the central reason Sen. McGovern insists his candidacy won't be devastated by the bitter-end opposition he has faced in the convention from labor leaders, party regulars and Wall Street.

Indeed, Sen. McGovern and his staff even see an opportunity in some Deep South and border states to win support of many alienated voters who have supported George Wallace.

"Richard Nixon isn't popular with the poor whites in the South" who voted for Mr. Wallace in 1968, Mr. Caddell asserts. "Sure, McGovern can't get the racist part of that vote, but the bigger Wallace group isn't ideological. Those people are alienated, and we can get the tremendous bulk of that vote." Mr. Caddell thinks that North Carolina, Arkansas, Georgia and Louisiana are among the possibilities for surprise McGovern victories.

Some analysts, however, see a potentially fatal flaw in the McGovern concept of the electorate. "It's very true that malaise and discontent exist," but the McGovern strategists "assume it has to go to the left, and that's not necessarily true," says Richard Scammon, an independent analyst. For example, he says, there is discontent among middle-class Catholics on issues such as busing and crime, and he finds that President Nixon is "much closer to this voter's type of dissent."

Certainly, the President and his campaign advisers think so. In large part, they have adopted the strategy promoted by conservative writer Kevin Phillips, author of the book, "The Emerging Republican Majority."

The Phillips book, with its emphasis on the Republican opportunity to capture the South, led to the "southern-strategy" slogan often heard during the early years of the Nixon administration. Certainly, Southern whites are a vital GOP target, especially if George Wallace doesn't run as a third-party candidate.

"McGovern can talk all he wants about reaching alienated conservative voters because he and Wallace are blood brothers—but they're not," one Nixon campaign aide says. "The Wallace vote is Nixon's in the South."

But the vital targets for Mr. Nixon are outside the South and comprise a group the Nixon men now describe as "middle Americans." At Mr. Phillips puts it: "The real target of the middle-American strategy is the lower-middle-class, urban-urban vote of the big-city states, much of it Catholic."

He continues: "These voters scheduled for an antibusing, parochial-school-hating, lower-property-tax pitch—will swing the electoral-vote declines of California, Illinois, Ohio, Pennsylvania and New York."

In the past, of course, these voters have been predominantly Democratic. But the Irish, Italian and Polish Catholics have been trending Republican, often feeling their neighborhood interests threatened by blacks who have increasing clout in the liberal-dominated Democratic Party.

Thus, in 1968, Mr. Nixon's Catholic vote rose to 57% against the 22% he won when running against Catholic John Kennedy in 1960. This time some Nixon men talk of winning an "overwhelming" Catholic vote, and some Democrats are fearful that they may succeed. "Nixon has done everything to win the Catholic vote except serve the 9 a.m. mass on Sundays," remarks one Irish-Catholic Democratic politician in New York.

The traditionally liberal Jewish vote is also seen as ripe for inroads by Mr. Nixon. In 1968 he won 17% of the Jewish vote, but the worry of many Jews about the McGovern candidacy is viewed as giving Mr. Nixon a chance to increase this share sharply. Now do the Nixon hopes rest only on the President's firm aid-to-Israel stand. GOP strategists see Jews worried about Mr. McGovern's backing of busing, scared of his proposals for huge increases in inheritance taxes and attracted to Mr. Nixon's law-and-order emphasis.

Mexican-American voters are the target of a Nixon pitch with interesting potentials. He won only 16% of the Chicano vote four years ago, and many Republicans concede that he probably can't get a lot more votes from this bloc. But, as one GOP voting analysis shows, a switch of only 8% of the Chicano vote could swing the outcome this year in California, Texas, Illinois and New Mexico.

One Nixon campaign aide sums up: "We don't need to win all those bloc votes or even get majorities. What we need are bigger chunks, and we think those chunks will be big enough to make what McGovern will draw from the new vote.

Finally, while pursuing their Democratic-style bloc strategy, the Republicans dispute the McGovern thesis that Mr. Nixon suffers a liability with a changenow electorate because he is running things. While they too think there is a desire for change, they're confident that the President is changing things the way most people want. "Nixon isn't seen as an establishment President," contends an official of the Committee to Reelect the President. "He comes across as a President actively seeking change," the official said, pointing to Nixon breakthroughs involving relations with China and Russia and, on the domestic front, the imposition of wage-price controls.

Moreover, a Nixon lieutenant argues, Mr. McGovern stands for such "extreme change" that he will scare most ordinary voters. "McGovern is the candidate of the clients of this country who advocate extreme change, and they aren't even a sizable minority, much less a majority," the Nixon man says scornfully.
Check - How Ed Nixon
- Under no circs should Ed ever go in black cap or such
- Warning
- None of family in black or Mex cap other people

Not a Porter mistake, walking on assume that Ed Nixon to as many events as possible.
Pole events - so police safe & events don't want Ed
MEMORANDUM

June 23, 1972

CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE HONORABLE JOHN N. MITCHELL

FROM: JEB S. MAGRUDER

SUBJECT: Liaison Between Pat Hutar and the Political Coordinators

As a part of the national volunteer program, Pat Hutar will be developing training manuals for voter registration, voter identification and get-out-the-vote. These will be particularly applicable in the 40 states where we will not be implementing intensive programs of telephone centers and direct mail. It will be necessary for Pat's training programs to be consistent with the techniques which the Political Coordinators wish to have the State Chairmen implement in those states. Accordingly, Pat should be in close contact with them as the manuals are being developed.

Operationally, that would best be accomplished by having one Political Coordinator assigned to work with Pat and to take the responsibility of assuring that the programmatic decisions are agreed to by all of the other Coordinators.

Recommendation

That Al Kaupinen be assigned to work closely with Pat for the next few weeks while she is developing the material for the training manuals. I would continue to oversee Pat's efforts to assure that the training materials are produced on time. It would be Al's responsibility to secure agreement among the Political Coordinators on the specific volunteer programs and training materials which are adopted.

Approve _______ Disapprove _______ Comment ____________________

CONFIDENTIAL
Committee for the Re-election of the President

MEMORANDUM

The Jeno Paulucci Press Conference was held Monday, July 10, 1972, at the Holiday Inn at 22nd and Collins in Miami Beach at 11:00 a.m. under the auspices of Harris & Star, advertising agency.
MIAMI BEACH, FLORIDA

JULY 10, 1972

STATEMENT BY JENO F. PAULUCCI ON BEHALF OF

CONCERNED DEMOCRATS AND INDEPENDENTS

I have come to Miami Beach today because I am an independent voter and a citizen who is interested in what happens at the Democratic Convention. This past week, a number of concerned Democrats and Independents joined with me in a full-page newspaper advertisement (which appeared in newspapers in leading U. S. cities including Chicago, Dallas, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, Washington, D. C., and Miami) expressing the fact that Senator George McGovern has us worried.

In the past, we personally have supported at times Democratic candidates for public office because they have stood for freedom for the individual and self-determination, which has made this country the envy of people around the world. The Democratic Party, as we have known it, has been a responsible party, offering reasonable programs and capable candidates to the American people for decades.

That record of responsibility is in danger of being abandoned by this convention adopting a platform that is unacceptable to a majority of Americans, and nominating a candidate for the Presidency of the United States who advocates "way-out" views on many of today's crucial issues, then the people of the U. S. will abandon the Democratic Party.

For this reason, and because we and many million of Indepen-
dents and Democrats will always put the interest of our country first and foremost, we are here to discourage the Democratic Party, if we can, from nominating Senator George McGovern for the Presidency.

The same reasons that prevent us from supporting George McGovern for the nomination will stop us from supporting him for the Presidency, if he is nominated:

...We cannot support a candidate whose defense policies would leave our country and its allies dangerously exposed to attack.

...We cannot support a candidate who advocates amnesty for those who fled service of their country, while others remained to perform their duty ... with some giving their lives in that performance.

...We cannot support a candidate who would destroy our ability to bargain for the return of American Prisoners of War.

...We cannot support a candidate who would abandon the concept of neighborhood schools, while encouraging the busing of small children to distant neighborhoods.

...We cannot support a candidate whose proposed excessive and unreasonable spending programs would result in either crushing tax increases or an erosion in the value of our currency ... resulting from a bankrupt treasury.

With the help of many other Independents and Democrats, I intend to do everything I can in the next few days to persuade the delegates to this convention not to allow outside ideological forces to wrest the Democratic Party from its traditional supporters.
We shall work with all our energy for the nomination of a responsible candidate in the progressive tradition of the Democratic Party.

It is common knowledge that Hubert H. Humphrey is a personal friend of mine, and I have supported him on many occasions, but today I am here to convince delegates to nominate any other candidate than George McGovern, who would destroy our free enterprises system. If the Democrats are out to win, they won't nominate George McGovern. If they do nominate him, they will find there are not just nine of us whose names appeared in the ad, but perhaps nine million or more Americans who feel as concerned as we do about our country. We just won't allow the U. S. to become a welfare state under McGovern.

Again, let me emphasize that I am here to do what I can to convince delegates to nominate any candidate other than George McGovern, such as Hubert Humphrey, Ted Kennedy, Wilbur Mills, or Ed Muskie. On the other hand, if McGovern is nominated, we are confident we could raise three to four million dollars or more to support a third-party candidate, if necessary. Lacking a third-party candidate, this same money could be spent on an Anti-McGovern campaign.

Others, like myself, believe in America first! If this convention fails to nominate a candidate who favors America first, it shall have failed the Democratic Party, and this Democratic Convention will have failed our country. That's why many Democrats and Independents are concerned about George McGovern. America needs a candidate with views on today's issues that won't prove
disastrous to the future of our country, and one who will attract broad support from Americans. America first...that's our concern.
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

SOUTH DAKOTA BUSINESS CHAIRMAN

Washington, June 9 — Mining company executive and attorney Kenneth C. Kellar of Lead has been named chairman of South Dakota Business and Industry for the Re-election of the President.

Announcement of the appointment was made by W. E. "Obie" O'Brien of Madison, Chairman of the South Dakota campaign committee.

Mr. Kellar is a director and chief counsel of the Homestake Mining Company, which he also serves as consultant in industrial relations and public affairs. In addition he has engaged in private legal practice for almost 40 years.

A former Republican state senator in South Dakota, Mr. Kellar has served as president of the greater South Dakota Association, a member of the South Dakota Water Resources Commission, and as a director of the American Mining Congress, the National Association of Manufacturers and the Business-Industry Political Action Committee.

A native of Lead, Mr. Kellar is a graduate of the University of Michigan and received law degrees from Michigan and from Stanford University. He served as a major in the U.S. Army during World War II.
MEMORANDUM FOR: KEN COLE
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT: Issue Monitoring System

Whatever happened to the project of establishing an issue monitoring system staffed by Domestic Council members? As I understood the proposal a few months ago, one man would be assigned to each issue and would be prepared to have a decision paper ready quickly for the campaign. Harper suggested at one point slightly modifying this so that there would be a fairly formal structure drawing on some of the media and political types. Is this whole system in place? If not, was an alternative decided upon?

I don't understand what our role is to do here.
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

CONTACT: DeVan L. Shumway
(202) 333-7060
#7-13(19)

STATEMENT BY CLARK MACGREGOR, CAMPAIGN DIRECTOR
OF THE COMMITTEE FOR THE RE-ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT

Washington, July 19 -- The decision by the employees of
the Minneapolis Star-Tribune to disavow the American
Newspaper Guild's endorsement of Senator McGovern for
President deserves the acclaim and applause of every
American citizen who relies on newspapers as a source
of information on the important issues of our day.

The Guild was ill-advised in openly abandoning the
time-honored objective of the American press to confine
partisanship to editorial pages and I hope newspaper
reporters throughout the nation will follow the Star-Tribune
example in demanding a referendum on the endorsement.

-30-
GENERAL MARK CLARK IS SOUTH CAROLINA HONORARY CHAIRMAN

WASHINGTON, July 23 -- General Mark W. Clark, commander in
chief of U.S. forces in the Far East during the latter part
of the Korean War, and later president of the Citadel from 1954
to 1965, will serve as honorary chairman of President Nixon's
South Carolina re-election campaign.

Announcement of General Clark's position was made today
by James M. Henderson of Greenville, chairman of the South
Carolina Committee for the Re-election of the President.

In a telegram to General Clark, President Nixon's national
campaign director, former Minnesota Congressman Clark MacGregor,
said: "We are most pleased that you are once again giving
your support to President Nixon. Your contribution to the
campaign, along with that of other members of your state
committee and the President's many supporters in South Carolina,
will, I am sure, place the state solidly in the Nixon column
this November."

General Clark served as chairman of President Nixon's 1968
campaign in South Carolina.

(more)
In accepting his position, General Clark described President Nixon as "a man of noble character, a man of great integrity, courageous, capable, and with a strong faith in God and country."

"I believe he is the only one capable of restoring the greatness and insuring the security of our country," he said.

Born in Madison Barracks, New York, General Clark was graduated from the U. S. Military Academy at West Point in 1917 and served in France during World War I. He was an instructor at the Army War College at the outbreak of World War II. In 1942 he laid the groundwork for future U.S. military operations in Great Britain and played a leading part in planning the invasion of North Africa.

In 1943 he became commanding general of the U.S. Fifth Army, which he led from North Africa on its successful amphibious invasion of Italy. At the end of the war he was commander of all allied fighting forces in Italy. He later served as U. S. High Commissioner for Austria.

In 1952 General Clark became commander in chief of the United Nations Command and commanding general of U. S. Army forces in the Far East, directing operations for the last year of the Korean War and signing the armistice which ended hostilities in July, 1953. In October of that year he retired from active service.

In 1954 he became president of the Citadel, the Military College of South Carolina, in Charleston, a post he held until his retirement in 1965. Since that time he has served as president emeritus.
ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR:  GORDON STRACHAN
FROM:  KEN KHACHIGIAN
SUBJECT:  ABEL SECONDING SPEECH

Sent copy of Abel seconding speech to Chuck Colson with suggestion that it be mailed out to all Steelworker locals.

This should also be a part of a package that can go out to unions later with this and other materials showing organized labor opposition to McGovern.

cc: Buchanan
In case you didn't receive a copy of the RNC Campaign Fact Book, attached is an additional copy that we received. Does it correspond with your views as to what should be issued as a campaign fact book on the issues?

We put a lot of time into this book over the similar book that 1701 did. My honest opinion is that neither book will be extensively used, but we agree to help 1701 & RNC produce whatever they thought they needed.
Fred -

I called Dan's office where they open the mail. They show that Dan did get Gordon's memo re the Yorty - Salvatori matter. Part of the problem could be the way Gordon sends his stuff. He still sends it to the White House office - and Frank has to then send it over here. His memo of July 7th re Yorty didn't reach us until July 11th - and it reached Dan's mail room on the 12th - which probably means Dan didn't actually get it until the 13th.

I haven't been so successful in tracking on the follow-up memo of the 14th - but the above should give you some ammunition. Your note on the July 7th memo to Dan said something like please handle this personally.

This is also what you wrote him on the Maricial memo of the same subject.

-----

FYI

Jack
MEMORANDUM FOR:  FRED MALEK
FROM:  GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT:  Mayor Sam Yorty

Fred, this is merely a personal note which I have mixed feelings about sending to you. Today, when I asked you about the Henry Salvatori telephone call to Bob and his suggestion for Mayor Sam Yorty, you told me you had detailed the matter to Dan Kingsley and that I should check with him for the status. My original memorandum was July 7 with a follow up of July 14.

I called Kingsley and he had not heard from you anything about the project. It may well be that papers crossed or you thought you had covered it orally with him or whatever. However, the problem is that Bob accepts whatever you say at face value. Had I informed Bob that the Salvatori-Yorty matter had been handled, the facts would have been otherwise. It is far better for you to tell me that a project hasn't been handled yet than that it has been handled by someone else. Otherwise, we are going to get caught sideways with Bob to the detriment of the President.
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
THURSDAY, PM, JULY 20, 1972

President Nixon's national campaign director Clark MacGregor today praised selection of former state Senator Harry L. Sears as New Jersey campaign chairman as "an outstanding choice -- one which gives us even more reason to believe that New Jersey will be firmly counted in the Nixon column in November."

Sears' appointment was announced yesterday by Governor William Cahill, chairman of the New Jersey Committee for the Re-election of the President.

In a telegram to Sears, MacGregor said, "You and Governor Cahill will, I am certain, provide us with extremely capable, dedicated and effective leadership for the campaign in New Jersey.

"I look forward to working with you and the Governor in the weeks and months ahead," he said, "and I hope and expect that many thousands of Democrats and Independents in New Jersey will be joining you and all Republicans in the state in working for the President's re-election.

(more)
"In selecting you to serve as campaign chairman, the Governor has made an outstanding choice -- one which gives us even more reason to believe that New Jersey will be firmly counted in the Nixon column in November."

MacGregor noted that Sears was "one of the first prominent Republicans in New Jersey" to announce support for the President in the 1968 campaign and that he worked "tirelessly and most effectively to help the President secure the Republican nomination and, subsequently to assure his election."

Sears, 52, served in the state Assembly from 1962 until 1967 and in the Senate from 1968 until 1971, when he did not seek re-election. He was Republican majority leader in the Senate.

After returning to private law practice in Morris County, he served as chairman on the Governor's State Tax Policy Committee.

A native New Jerseyan and a resident of Mountain Lake, Sears is a graduate of Tusculum College in Tennessee and of the Rutgers University Law School. A Navy veteran of World War II, he served in the Atlantic, Mediterranean and Pacific Theaters.
MEMORANDUM FOR THE HONORABLE CLARK MacGREGOR

FROM:      JEB S. MAGRUDER

SUBJECT:  Senator Dole

As you may know, it is customary for a Chairman of the Republican National Committee to be elected on the last day of the Republican Convention. It has come to my attention that Senator Bob Dole has become anxious about whether there has been any determination on the matter of his continuing in office.

Since we have been working very closely with the Republican National Committee under his leadership and he has frequently assisted us in working for the President's re-election, it would appear that it would be natural for us to provide some form of reassurance. However, this question is one which you should determine in whatever manner you deem appropriate.

If a decision is made that the Senator should continue as National Chairman, then it would be desirable for this to be communicated to him at an early date. In addition, it would seem appropriate that he have an opportunity to meet with the President so that the Senator will be able to indicate to the Convention and to leaders around the country that the decision was made carefully and was communicated to him directly.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON
July 20, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL.

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. Haldeman
FROM: John Dean
SUBJECT: Potential Disruptions at the 1972 Republican National Convention

The Democratic National Convention provided some indication of the potential level of disruptions that might be expected at the Republican Convention. Basically, the demonstrators in Miami last week failed to confront the Democratic Convention with sufficient numbers to cause serious problems or to receive the amount of publicity that was desired. No more than a total of 4,000 - 5,000 individuals engaged in protest activity. Of this number, approximately 2,500 were members of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), National Welfare Rights Organization (NWRO) and the National Tenants Organization (NTO), which joined in demonstrations on behalf of poor people. None of these three groups presently plan to return in August.

Approximately 2,000, predominantly white, antiwar activists camped at Flamingo Park. These individuals from numerous different militant groups were never able to organize so as to form a united front. The Miami Conventions Coalition (MCC), which had attempted to serve this function, proved a failure in obtaining any agreement from so many different views. Rennie Davis has now formed a new organization, the Joint People's Action Coalition (JPAC), but it is doubtful that JPAC will prove more successful than MCC.

A major problem of the individuals gathered at Flamingo Park was that they were essentially leaderless. Although activists with a national reputation such as Rennie Davis, Abbie Hoffman, David Dellinger and Jerry Rubin were in Miami last week, they spent little time at Flamingo Park and maintained no following of their own. It is not known at this time whether these "leaders" will take a more active role with the demonstrators in August.
Nor did the groups most prone toward violence achieve any success. The ZIPPIE faction of the Youth International Party (YIP) revealed itself to be ineffectual and was generally ostracized by the other demonstrators. Due to the indictment of six of its leaders on charges of conspiring to disrupt the Republican Convention, the Vietnam Veterans Against the War (VVAW) became very bitter, but provoked no serious trouble. However, despite their small size, VVAW retains the capacity for violent tactics.

The organizers planning demonstrations for August still are very wary of creating incidents at the Republican Convention that could be used against Senator McGovern. Some even suspect that the Administration intends to cause a confrontation for political purposes. Due to this pessimistic assessment and the practical difficulties encountered in attracting people to Miami, it appears unlikely that more than twice the number of demonstrators that attended the Democratic Convention will attend the Republican Convention. In addition, the Cuban groups that counter-demonstrated at the Democratic Convention showed interest in cooperating with local officials to avoid confrontations with the anti-war groups and, therefore, should prove less of a factor for potential violence than previously anticipated.
ETHNIC GROUPS ORGANIZE FOR RE-ELECTION OF NIXON:
VOLPE AND DERWINSKI TO HEAD EFFORT

Secretary of Transportation John Volpe and Illinois Congressman Ed Derwinski have been chosen to lead the campaign of the Heritage Groups for the Re-Election of the President according to Fred V. Malek, Deputy Director of the Committee for the Re-Election of the President. Secretary Volpe would serve as honorary chairman, and Congressman Derwinski will be chairman of the group's executive board, which includes two other congressmen, a mayor, an assistant Secretary of the Treasury and other leading Republicans of ethnic background.

The executive board will set the basic policy guidelines for the Republican effort to win ethnic votes.

"The new Democrat elitists have closed the door to ethnic groups and the party's traditional friends," said Malek, "and many of them have expressed their intent to work on behalf of the President's re-election. This organization will assure a coordinated response on our part."

According to the 1969 Current Population Survey, more than 80 million Americans identify themselves as "ethnic Americans." The figure does not include blacks.
The Republican Party has been working actively since 1968 for a larger share of this vote, with a full-time staff operation at Republican National Committee headquarters. The Heritage Groups for the Re-Election of the President is a culmination of that effort and will bring into the campaign Democrats and Independents as well.

The Director of the Heritage Groups campaign operation is Laszlo Pasztor, Director of the Heritage Groups Division of the Republican National Committee. Executive Director for special activities is Jack Burgess, a former head of the Nationalities Division of the Republican National Committee.

The Heritage Groups for the Re-Election of the President will be headquartered at the RNC.

Members of the executive board, including Secretary Volpe, Congressman Derwinski, and Pasztor are: Reps. Silvio Conte (R-Mass) and Bill Scherle (R-Iowa); Cleveland Mayor Ralph Perk; Eugene Rossides, assistant secretary of the Treasury; Mrs. Anna Chennault and Phil Cuarino, both of Washington, D.C.; and Thomas C. Pappas of Boston.

Republican National co-chairman Tom Evans noted that President Nixon has called the GOP the "Party of the Open Door" and said that the large number of ethnic Americans coming into the party was one expression of their support for the President. "The Nixon Administration and the Republican Party reflect the concerns and needs of all Americans, and I believe the vote of Americans of ethnic background will reflect this in November," Evans states.
MEMORANDUM

July 25, 1972

CONFIDENTIAL

TO: H. R. HALDEMAN

FROM: MURRAY CHOTINER

McGovern responded to a letter from Elias Demetracopolous ("leader" of the Greek cause in exile) by saying he would just about sever all ties with the Junta in Greece.

I have some information concerning Elias (the last name is too long to write again). Someone should watch this situation.

Elias appeared before a Congressional Committee and his comments were not favorable.

MMC:a
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Saturday, July 22, 1972

statement by Francis L. Dale, Chairman of the Committee for the Re-election of the President, on the President's Choice of Vice President Agnew as the Next Vice President of the United States

President Nixon's decision to keep the winning Nixon-Agnew team together is a welcome one to Republicans and the great majority of Americans who support the responsible and productive record of the Nixon Administration.

Vice President Agnew has been a vital part of the leadership team which has laid the foundations of a generation of peace in the world and prosperity at home. When President Nixon is re-elected, Mr. Agnew will continue to be an eloquent voice speaking out for the hopes and aspirations of the peaceful, hard-working majority of Americans.

The choice the voters make in November will now certainly be clearcut: shall we continue to be led by the Nixon Administration with its emphasis on accomplishing the possible in a responsible manner; or shall we turn to an untried team of opposition candidates selected by a radical elite with an emphasis on promising the impractical and the impossible and threatening to leave the United States militarily defenseless.

This choice is a challenge which we accept. I predict that it will result in a clear mandate for the Nixon-Agnew team in November -- a mandate to continue leading America toward peaceful prosperity.
PRESS RELEASE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
July 22, 1972

Contact: Mitch Daniels
632-5401

Following President Nixon's announcement regarding his choice of a 1972 running-mate, L. Keith Bulen, National Committeeman and 11th District Chairman, issued the following statement:

"The President's designation of Vice President Spiro Agnew for the second spot on our 1972 ticket is a well-deserved recognition of loyal services to our nation and our party. His forthrightness on national issues has won him the admiration of great numbers of Americans, whose support will strengthen the national ticket this fall. Of great importance to those of us in active political life, Mr. Agnew has been a dedicated soldier of our party, willing to go anywhere on behalf of fellow Republicans."

"His trips to Indiana since 1968 were memorable and unifying experiences, and we look forward to welcoming him back to the state frequently this fall and throughout his second term."

-more-
"For his performance of his duties, he has earned the respect and support of the American public. For his tireless devotion to the Republican Party, he has earned the endorsement of the delegates to next month's National Convention. I back the President's action."

-30-
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
SATURDAY, JULY 22, 1972

STATEMENT BY HONORABLE CLARK MACGREGOR, CAMPAIGN DIRECTOR OF THE COMMITTEE FOR THE RE-ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT, ON THE PRESIDENT'S CHOICE OF VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW AS THE NEXT VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

I am delighted that the President has chosen Vice President Agnew as his runningmate in 1972. Four years ago, when President Nixon selected then-Governor Agnew as his Vice Presidential nominee, Mr. Nixon said that one of his prime objectives was to select a man who was capable of the duties of the Presidency should that need arise. In his first term, Vice President Agnew has demonstrated the qualities of leadership which the President perceived when he selected him. There is no doubt in my mind that if the need arose, Vice President Agnew would make an outstanding President.

That a great many Americans share my view was demonstrated in the New Hampshire primary when more people chose to write in the Vice President's name than voted for any other candidate except President Nixon himself. That was a remarkable demonstration of Vice President Agnew's continuing respect among the American people.

(more)
I am sure the delegates to the Republican National Convention will overwhelmingly ratify the President's choice and that in November the people will return this winning team to the leadership of our country.

I congratulate Vice President Agnew and pledge him my continued enthusiastic support.
EYES ONLY

MEMORANDUM FOR: JEB MAGRUDER
FROM: DWIGHT L. CHAPIN

July 6, 1972
2:30 p.m.

A suggestion -- The day after McGovern's nomination or after his acceptance speech, why don't we try to get as many newspapers around the country as possible to denounce the McGovern nomination and express their support for the President.

The effect of this happening immediately after the McGovern acceptance can help to serve to take McGovern off the high plane which he'll come out of the Convention on. It also gives us some immediate material to be used for mailing purposes and other propaganda uses.

cc: Gordon Strachan
    Chuck Colson
CONFIDENTIAL

FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: MURRAY CHOTINER

Following up my memo concerning Eagleton, which was sent to you before the expose broke last night -- it is suggested that the following be considered:

1. Eagleton has refused to release the medical records concerning himself.

2. He denies that alcoholism had anything to do with his hospitalization. The medical records should either prove or disprove that.

3. It is great to know that he has "recovered" from his "depressions" and "fatigue." However, the public is entitled to know all of the facts since he will be one heart beat away from the Presidency if, by a mistake, McGovern is elected.

4. The Knight newspapers, since it broke the original story, or someone in Missouri not connected with the campaign, should make a highly publicized demand for the medical records.

P.S. I understand the Air Force will not accept a man for intelligence who has ever had psychiatric treatment.
HUMPHREY SAYS MCGOVERN'S WELFARE PLAN WOULD COST TAXPAYERS $115 BILLION

LOS ANGELES, May 30---Senator Hubert H. Humphrey said today that Senator George McGovern's current "welfare giveaway plan" would cost the American taxpayer an additional $115 billion.

Speaking to business and civic leaders in a Town Hall luncheon meeting in the Biltmore Hotel, Humphrey said that the additional cost would be paid by increases in the personal income tax.

McGovern's proposals not only are an "unbelievable burden on middle income families" Humphrey said, but they lack work requirements and they make more than 500,000 blind, disabled and aged Californians worse off than under present welfare programs.

Humphrey proposed his own welfare reforms including increases in social security benefits, federalization of welfare, jobs and minimum benefits of $3,000 a year for a family of four based on need.

FOLLOWING IS THE TEXT OF HUMPHREY'S REMARKS:

--More--
TEXT OF SENATOR HUMPHREY'S SPEECH TO TOWN HALL LUNCHEON

BILTMORE HOTEL, LOS ANGELES     MAY 30, 1972

Every person who lives in California is somehow affected by the massive welfare system of this state. There's no getting around it. The citizens of this state either pay the cost of welfare or receive its benefits. The welfare system touches everyone.

And California has the nation's number one welfare problem. There are more people on welfare in California than in any other state. And more is spent by California taxpayers on welfare than by citizens of any other state in the union.

As a candidate and as your President, I want to tackle the problem in a compassionate and reasonable way.

The people want an answer to this welfare mess.

They expect a man who wants to be President of the United States to have a realistic, sensible welfare program.

Today, I want to do two things.

I want to outline a reasoned, sound welfare program—one that will meet the needs of those who truly require help, while at the same time not increase taxes on the middle income families.

And, I want to match my programs against Senator McGovern's welfare program. I want to put these two programs before the people of California so that they will see that there clearly is a difference.

The people of California have a right to ask:

--- What is Senator McGovern's true welfare program?

The fact is— he has two programs and both mean higher taxes for middle income families.

Senator McGovern, on July 29, 1971, introduced a welfare bill in the United States Senate. This program will put 104 million persons on the welfare rolls and, according to the Senate Finance Committee, it will cost American taxpayers $72 billion.

This bill will provide a $6,500 guaranteed annual income for every family of four.

In our debate last Sunday, Senator McGovern claimed that this was not his proposal, and that he introduced this legislation at the request of a welfare group.

Now that Senator McGovern has abandoned and publicly disavowed the $72 billion welfare proposal, we can focus on his second proposal.

According to Senator McGovern's new proposal, everybody in the United States will get a $1,000 welfare check from the United States Treasury.

-MORE-
HUMPHREY WELFARE SPEECH--MAY 30, 1972

As he said on May 25, 1972:

"It wouldn't make any difference what your income was, you'd still get that $1,000 a person." (Liz Drew Show).

Regardless of your need, regardless of how much wealth you have, under the McGovern program a government handout would still come to you, just the same as it would come to billionaire Howard Hughes.

I think the people of California have a right to know some fundamental problems with this scheme.

First, the cost.

On our Sunday debate, Senator McGovern said, "I have proposed nothing in the way of welfare reform or defense reform or full employment or anything else without providing a method for financing it."

Yet, he refuses to tell the people of California how much his welfare handout scheme will cost or who will pay how much.

He has said he doesn't have an "exact estimate on this proposal."

I find this statement unbelievable.

Maybe I can help all of us determine the approximate cost of his program to the taxpayers.

Simple arithmetic tells us that $1,000 paid to every man, woman, and child in the United States times 210 million Americans equals $210 billion.

I am well aware that Senator McGovern does not intend for the treasury to lose the whole $210 billion.

He does have some suggestions as to how the treasury might get some of it back. Here are a few:

--He suggests eliminating every taxpayer's personal exemption of $750. This act, unwise as it is, would bring $63 billion back into the treasury.

Senator McGovern's program now costs $147 billion.

--He suggests scrapping the present welfare system. That would return $7 billion to the treasury.

Now Senator McGovern's proposal would cost $140 billion.

--From this point, he makes suggestions but doesn't specify dollar amounts that could be returned to the treasury. For example, he says money from the social security trust fund might be used to finance this $1,000 welfare giveaway program.

--MORE--
I am opposed to tampering with the social security system. I believe this is contrary to the best interests of 20 million Americans now receiving social security, and to the rest of us who hope to be beneficiaries of this system.

The question now is--who pays the $140 billion bill?

Economists tell me that the government can be expected to recoup a maximum of about $25 billion in excess income taxes resulting from the additional income the McGovern's giveaway puts in the taxpayers' hands.

This still leaves $115 billion.

Senator McGovern says that he will let the rich and the big corporations pay for this cost.

But after some businessmen criticized him, last week he placed a full page ad in the Wall Street Journal, in which he retreated from his earlier positions of increasing the corporate tax rate from 48 to 52 per cent.

So apparently he does not want corporations to pay for this $115 billion.

Again, I want to ask--who pays the $115 billion bill?

The answer now is--the individual taxpayer--you and I.

Senator McGovern's experts, however, do not accept my figures of about $115 billion additional cost to the American taxpayer. At a special briefing his experts held for the press last Saturday on the McGovern welfare scheme, some of them said that the total figure would be $60 billion.

Even if we assume the $60 billion McGovern figure--and let us do so for a moment--the Senate Finance Committee staff tells me that the added cost to the American taxpayer can be translated into these human terms:

--To the single secretary, living in San Francisco, making $8,000 a year, the committee says the McGovern plan means an increased tax of $567.

The unmarried persons suffers most under Senator McGovern's plan.

--To a family of four living in Long Beach, making $12,000 a year, the McGovern proposal would increase their income tax by $409.

--To a family of four making $15,000, the McGovern tax would be $588.

The Senate committee calculated these figures from basic data provided by Senator McGovern's own proposal.

-MORE-
It's clear that the McGovern $1,000 welfare scheme puts the burden of paying for welfare where it has always been—on the middle income working family.

The cost is simply unbelievable. But there are other serious flaws in his approach.

What happens to the work requirement that must be a part of a welfare system?

He says that under his scheme, welfare is an automatic system.

"There would be no requirement to work anymore than there is now a requirement to work. You can't force somebody to work if they don't want to work."

But if people are able-bodied, and there are jobs, they should work and not receive a $1,000 welfare benefit.

And they want to work!

Senator McGovern's scheme is a share the welfare, but not share the work program.

Finally, under Senator McGovern's proposal, the over 500,000 blind disabled, and aged Californians who now receive public assistance would be worse off under the present system.

Right now, they receive on an average of $178 a month.

Under Senator McGovern's proposal, they would get a $1,000 a year, or $85 a month—his plan would take away $93 a month from every aged, blind, and disabled persons unless the state out of its own tax funds supplemented this payment.

This is hardly reform. And it strikes against those who can least help themselves.

In contrast to Senator McGovern's program, let me outline my proposal for welfare reform.

Its aim is to end hunger, to strengthen the family, to cut the bureaucracy and red tape, to provide jobs, eliminate fraud, and treat recipients and taxpayers fairly.

First, we need an immediate 25 per cent increase in social security benefits.

Second, we can take the five million elderly poor, provide them with a basic assistance benefit to lift them immediately above the poverty line.

Third, I want an immediate increase in the food stamp budget, so that we could really begin to wipe out hunger in the United States.

-MORE-
In California, there are an estimated 300,000 hungry children and 100,000 hungry adults.

Four, I propose important and far reaching changes in the present welfare system.

--We will phase out the present welfare system.

--It will be replaced with a welfare program paid for and run entirely by the federal government, thereby removing it as a burden on state and local governments.

--It will establish a beginning basic benefit level of $3,000 a year for a family of four. But this benefit will not go to every family in this nation. It will be restricted to those in need. There will be firm and suitable work requirements.

--We will guard against fraud and deception through careful scrutiny of those who apply and continuous review of those who receive a benefit.

My welfare proposal will include day care centers and expanded job and training programs to help people get off welfare.

And finally, but crucially, it would provide jobs--by stimulating the private sector and through a program of public service job opportunities.

This program I have outlined is responsible--it is realistic, and can be passed by the Congress and accepted by the American people.

It provides needed financial relief for the homeowners of California by federalizing the costs. It provides hope for the 1.5 million Californians on welfare and it does not create a permanent welfare population.
BUCHANAN SAYS MCGOVERN DEFENSE CUTBACKS
WOULD TAKE JOBS AWAY FROM CALIFORNIANS

SANTA BARBARA -- Senator Hubert H. Humphrey charged today that
"Senator George McGovern is running away from the serious implications of his $32 billion defense cutback."

Speaking at Santa Barbara's Channel City Club, Humphrey said that "Senator McGovern has refused to admit in any of the states he has campaigned in thus far that his massive cutbacks will cause base closings or job losses.

"Apparently, Senator McGovern would have us believe that all the job losses and base closings stemming from his unilateral defense cutbacks would occur only in those states which do not have presidential primaries.

"Thus far, Senator McGovern has campaigned in over 10 primary states. At Nebraska's Offut Air Force Base -- the home of the Strategic Air Command -- he denied it would be hurt although he has proposed a 60 percent reduction in our B-52 force. And last week in Sacramento, Senator McGovern vehemently denied that any of the military installations in the area of the capital would be touched by his huge defense slashes.

- more -
2. "California voters should find it difficult to believe that the McGovern cutback of roughly 30 percent in our Armed Forces manpower could be achieved without extensive economic impact in this state. "The Senator's refusal to pinpoint exactly where in the United States his massive cutbacks will occur matches his evasiveness in explaining who will pay the tax bill for his $1,000 per person giveaway scheme. "Senator McGovern's unwillingness to state precisely what areas or who would be affected is certainly good politics, but given the actual facts of his proposals, it is inevitable that some of California's 75 military bases will be the targets of his meat ax cuts. " - He has proposed halting all surface shipbuilding, reducing the number of aircraft carriers from 15 to 6 and cutting the American fleet in half. " - He has proposed a 25 percent cutback in active Army divisions which would most likely cause a corresponding cutback in U.S. Army installations. " -He has proposed cutting Air Force personnel by close to 250,000 men, with serious implications for strategic bombers, interceptors, tactical air wings and support forces. Humphrey said that the jobs of many people who live in these communities come directly or indirectly from the operation of bases. When they close or are severely cut back, the jobs of hundreds of thousands of military and civilian personnel are threatened. Senator Humphrey reiterated three major themes regarding defense cutbacks which he has stressed throughout the campaign. "One, there should be a thorough effort to root out and eliminate waste in defense spending."
3. "Two, significant cutbacks must be mutually negotiated with the Soviet Union and not be unilateral.

"Three, any cutbacks stemming from such negotiations should be planned in such a way as to include programs which would prevent any significant unemployment increases or serious harm to local communities."

Humphrey said that "because of the widespread consequences of massive shutdowns of military bases and defense plants, all Californians have an important stake in the outcome of this Tuesday's presidential primary."

- H H H -

5/31/72
305/72
HUMPHREY POINTS OUT MAJOR FLAWS IN McGOVERN GIVEAWAY SCHEME

LOS ANGELES - Senator Hubert H. Humphrey charged today that Senator McGovern's proposal to use money from the Social Security Trust Fund to finance the McGovern $1,000 giveaway is contrary to the best interests of 20 million elderly Americans.

The text of the Senator's remarks follows:

I am opposed to tampering with the social security system. It is there for a purpose -- people pay into it when they are working because they know they will have income protection when they retire.

I don't want our social security system used to finance Senator McGovern's $1,000 giveaway scheme.

But that is only one part of the McGovern proposal that could well hurt elderly Californians. Under the McGovern $1,000 giveaway, over 500,000 blind, disabled and aged Californians who now receive public assistance would be worse off than under the present system.

Right now, these people receive an average of $178 a month. Under the McGovern proposal, they would get $1,000 a year or $85 a month -- his plan would take away $93 a month from every aged, blind and disabled person unless the state supplemented this payment out of its own tax funds.

I'm opposed to this scheme. This is hardly reform.

There are things we could do. I think that we need an immediate 25 percent increase in social security. We can do this now, and we ought to do this now. Then, we can take the five million elderly poor, provide them with a basic assistance benefit to lift them above the poverty line. And, we can make needed changes in Medicare -- eliminating the deductible, freezing the copayments and providing prescription drugs.

These three steps would be a start -- a downpayment on a decent life for older Americans.
2. These proposals are responsible. They aren't welfare. They are opportunity. That's what people want -- they want opportunity. Older Americans want to be treated as people -- not to be shut away in a corner, forgotten and left alone.

Life doesn't stop at 65. Opportunities open up at 65. That's what we really are talking about here today -- opportunities, not $1,000 welfare schemes or giant giveaway programs.

We are talking about the opportunity to have a job, to live a useful life, to build neighborhoods. That's what I have spent a lifetime working for. And, I am proud of what I have seen here in your community. This community has gotten it together.

The secret is clear: the involvement of people. The closing paragraph of a brochure published by your Community Labor Action Committee says it best...

"There is now hope in the face of Watts because its people aspire to the future. The young are reaching up and the old are reaching out to make Watts an example to the nation and to the world: That a community united can power itself out of despair into hope and out of a blighted past into a moving, Changing present."

That's powerful. That is what I have been fighting for my entire life.

I want to change things. I want to put this nation back to work, doing things, building, growing, living together in peace.

I want to put a little soul in government. I want to be your President. And, I need your help now.

Let us march together now as we have marched together before.

- H H H -

5/31/72
304/72
On December 2, 1971, the principal candidates for the Democratic nomination for President entered into an agreement imposing reasonable maximum limitations on the amount of money to be spent on radio and television advertising. This agreement was negotiated under the auspices of the Chairman of the Democratic National Committee and was entered into in the spirit of the reform which has typified this election year.

The agreement provides that a candidate may expend up to $413,000 in the State of California on this form of advertising. In addition, a 5% contingency fund constituting a pool of $47,333 can be utilized assuming no portion of these funds were expended in previous primary campaigns.

I am concerned that a violation of this agreement has occurred.

My concern is caused by the obviously heavy saturation of such advertising on behalf of Senator McGovern. As a consequence, I directed my staff to conduct an investigation of his expenditures of radio and television advertising in this State.

Even though this investigation is only partially complete, it establishes that there is a clear violation of the spending limitations agreement by Senator McGovern. Our investigation was conducted through Friday, May 26. It discloses as follows:

There are 67 television stations in the State of California. We obtained reports from 39 of these stations showing expenditures of $337,000.
There are 231 radio stations in the state and we obtained reports from 104 of these stations showing expenditures of $101,000. This establishes $416,000 worth of radio and television advertising purchased by Senator McGovern; a figure in excess of the amount permitted under the agreement.

Remaining to report are some 26 additional television and 127 additional radio stations who refuse to give the information over the telephone, but insist on on-site inspection of their records. However, it was clear that on many of these stations, additional purchases had been made. Furthermore, many of these stations indicated that additional purchases were expected because of requests for time availability.

The results which I have indicated clearly establish violation of the agreement on the part of Senator McGovern. This agreement is a very important part of the reform spirit which attempts to limit the huge amount of money spent in campaigns and establishes reasonableness for disclosure for the benefit of the public.

Of major importance is the fact that the parties to this agreement are seeking to become the President of the United States. Each personally signed his own name. Their integrity must go with their signature. It is important to know whether Senator McGovern will stand by his agreement and his signature.

I'm calling on Senator McGovern and his campaign staff to comply with the provisions of this agreement and to immediately suspend and cancel all radio and television advertising in excess
OF THAT PERMITTED. THIS DEMAND IS BASED ON THE SPIRIT OF THE
REFORM UNDER WHICH WE HAVE ALL OPERATED DURING THESE PRIMARY
CAMPAIGNS AND UPON THE INTEGRITY OF EACH OF THE SIGNERS.

I HAVE FORWARD A COPY OF THIS STATEMENT TO SENATOR
MCGOVERN'S CAMPAIGN MANAGER THIS MORNING.

UNDER CURRENT LAW, ALL RADIO AND TELEVISION STATIONS ARE
TO MAINTAIN FOR TWO YEARS AS PUBLIC RECORD, BUYS MADE BY, OR ON BEHALF OF, POLITICAL CANDIDATES FOR FEDERAL OFFICE. OUR FIGURES ARE BASED UPON OUR OWN INVESTIGATION OF THOSE PUBLIC RECORDS. I URGE EACH OF YOU TO INVESTIGATE WITH THESE STATIONS THE STATEMENTS WHICH I HAVE MADE. OUR WORKSHEETS ARE ALSO AVAILABLE FOR YOUR REVIEW.

I URGE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NEWS MEDIA TO CONDUCT THEIR OWN INVESTIGATION TO FURTHER SUBSTANTIATE THE SIZE OF THE VIOLATION OF OUR AGREEMENT.

IN CONCLUSION, I WISH TO REITERATE OUR DEMAND THAT SENATOR MCGOVERN AND HIS CAMPAIGN ORGANIZATION IMMEDIATELY CEASE FURTHER VIOLATION OF HIS AGREEMENT AND THAT THEY CANCEL ANY AND ALL RADIO AND TELEVISION ADVERTISING IN EXCESS OF THIS PERMITTED BY THE AGREEMENT. A FIGURE WHICH WE HAVE REASON TO BELIEVE MAY RUN SEVERAL HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS IN EXCESS OF THE AMOUNT PERMITTED.

Figure 1: \( \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} \).
CONTACT: Joe McLaughlin

FOR RELEASE: Thursday, June 1

HUMPHREY'S TAX LOOPHOLE CLOSING TO CUT CALIFORNIA PROPERTY TAXES 40 PERCENT; LAUDS SERRANO DECISION

Los Angeles, June 1--United States Senator Hubert Humphrey today said his proposed legislation to close tax loopholes for the "super rich and giant corporations" will mean $1.5 billion can be returned to California's taxpayers for property tax relief.

In a speech at Hollenbeck Junior High School in East Los Angeles, Senator Humphrey spoke of educational reform and a way to cut California property taxes by 40 percent. He presented John Serrano, who initiated the case which resulted in the landmark California Supreme Court decision on equal educational opportunity for all children, regardless of economic level.

Following is the text of Senator Humphrey's remarks:

"It is an honor to be with the man who symbolizes the battle for equal educational opportunity on behalf of all of America's children.

"Here is yet another important contribution made by a Mexican American to this state and our nation.

"Here in East Los Angeles and at Hollenbeck Junior High School the Serrano decision will touch the lives of children and families in this community.

"The courageous battle joined by John Serrano and others who aided in his case mean:

"--that no child in California should be penalized with a second class education because he does not live in a wealthy neighborhood.

"I have spent my life fighting for equal opportunity for all Americans. And I can tell you that when the property tax is used as the main source of paying for our schools, then fairness, equal opportunity and a good education are denied to our children.

-more-
"For too long, Americans have relied on the property tax for educational purposes. Homeowners and children have been the losers.

"We need a new method of financing American education so that the children of East Los Angeles will have the same educational opportunity as the children privileged enough to attend schools in Beverly Hills.

"It is wrong that this educational disparity exists in the Los Angeles area and in cities and suburbs across America.

"I have proposed a fundamental reform in the way taxpayers and communities pay their educational costs, so that we can have equal education in all of the neighborhoods of America.

"-The Federal government must immediately begin to pay one-third of the costs of elementary and secondary public education in America.

"-The Federal government must establish a special educational trust fund to give education a top priority in our budget and to protect these funds from any reductions not in the best interests of our children.

"And no reform of our system of educational financing can be complete without relieving the burden of the homeowner's property tax.

"Having the Federal government pay a greater share of educational costs will lift some of property tax burden.

"But we must do more. In addition to this, I have sponsored legislation to slam the door shut on tax loopholes for the super rich and the giant corporations. Closing these loopholes means that $16 billion can be returned immediately to the taxpayers to cut their property taxes.

"California's share will be $1.5 billion. This means that the property taxes of every California homeowner will be cut by at least 30 to 40 percent.

"With this plan, we will be on the road to tax fairness in America.

"I have been on this road for a long time. I've been fighting for tax fairness and tax justice when it wasn't popular to do so.

"My opponent doesn't have this type of record. All of a sudden, California voters learn that he's going to join me in the battle to close loopholes and fight against special privilege.

"But what does he do?

"The first step Senator McGovern wants to take to reform our tax system is to take away the $750 personal exemptions of 210 million Americans.

"He then suggests that he might remove deductions on the interest payments for home mortgages.

"One of his plans also calls for eliminating medical deductions.

-more-
"Senator McGovern seems all too anxious to deny hard working families the only breaks they get and need from our tax system.

"But at the same time, he spends literally thousands of dollars taking an ad in the Wall Street Journal apologizing to the big banks and stockbrokers for his positions on tax reform.

"I challenge George McGovern to run that ad in East Los Angeles. I challenge him to mail this ad to the working families of California.

"Senator McGovern's way is not the way you get tax reform, property tax relief and good schools in Los Angeles.

"We need a President who will not back down in front of any group when his programs are presented.

"We need a President who will level with the American people.

"We need a President who will have the courage to say the same thing in East Los Angeles as he says on Wall Street.

- HHH -
The results of the poll are of course disappointing but they are in direct conflict with other reports from different parts of the state which clearly indicate an upsurge of Humphrey strength following the debates on national television. There are also in direct conflict with national polls conducted by both Gallup and Harris which show that as recently as the past few days, Senator Humphrey remains the overwhelming favorite on rank and file Democrats all over the country.

California is now experiencing a massive concentration of spending by the McGovern camp which is unprecedented in the history of California politics. The attempt to use radio and television advertising in the form of spot announcements and concentrated electronic and printed media began four weeks ago. It undoubtedly helped produce a favorable image of Senator McGovern, but we are confident that candidates cannot be sold like cereal. We are confident that once the public policy positions of Senator McGovern become clear to the Democratic voters of California, and it's clear that there is a difference between the positions taken by Senator Humphrey and Senator McGovern, then support for Senator Humphrey will continue to increase and will result in a primary victory on Tuesday.

The debates will help clarify these issues and the Humphrey media campaign on radio and television, which is beginning in intensity today, will further help inform the voters of California that Senator Humphrey best represents the welfare of the working men and women of this state.

The voters of California will reject on Tuesday the McGovern plan to give
Governor Reagan, Ronald Hughes and every man, woman and child in America, regardless of need, a giveaway of $1000 a year.

The voters of California will reject the McGovern proposal which will inevitably produce a drastic increase in taxes by working class and middle income taxpayers who will be forced to carry this heavy welfare burden.

The voters of California will reject the McGovern proposal on national defense which will endanger the security of our country by reducing our forces without requiring a similar reduction from the Soviet Union and which will result in massive unemployment in this state.

These are the crucial issues.

We will not permit the reckless expenditures of unlimited funds to cloud these issues. We again ask Senator McGovern to disclose the details of his campaign expenditures in California just as Senator Humphrey did. If he didn’t have anything to hide, he would have made that disclosure by now.

It is interesting that in the early days of those primaries, he campaigned as the man with open books and attacked Senator Muskie and others for not releasing their financial details as early as he. Today, he prefers to keep the voters of California in the dark.

Our campaign in the closing days of this election will be aimed at enlightening the voters of California. We have every confidence that a discussion of the issues will produce a Humphrey victory on Tuesday.
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: JUNE 2, 1972  P.M.

San Francisco Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp announced today that he intends to vote for Senator Hubert L. Humphrey in the California Democratic primary election on Tuesday, June 6.

Kopp, who is state chairman of the California delegation for Senator Henry M. Jackson (Dem., Washington), said he still intends to support Jackson for the nomination in Miami. "But," he said, "in the interests of the Democratic party as a whole, I am endorsing Senator Humphrey in the California primary.

"Senator Jackson, while still on the California ballot, has in effect been forced to withdraw from our state primary because of lack of campaign funds," Kopp said, "and I therefore request and urge his thousands of supporters in California to vote for Senator Humphrey on June 6th."

Kopp emphasized that this does not mean that Senator Jackson has withdrawn from the battle for nomination for the Presidency; but it does mean, he said, that his California supporters should have the opportunity to cast a meaningful vote in this primary.

The Supervisor added that the platform of Senator
George McGovern does not truly represent the goals of the Democratic party, while that of Senator Humphrey does.

"McGovern is actually appealing to a small segment of the Democratic constituency," Kopp said, "and a vote for him in the winner-take-all California primary would jeopardize the goals long sought by a great many hard-working Democrats across the country.

"Senator Humphrey is committed to carrying out the reform program that we want to see accomplished in the next administration," Kopp said.
HUMPHREY '72
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FOR RELEASE: Friday, noon, June 2

HUMPHREY COMPARES HIS POSITIVE JOB PROGRMS WITH MCGOVERN DEFENSE JOBS SLASHES

SACRAMENTO, June 2--Senator Hubert H. Humphrey outlined today details of his programs to create new jobs calling this the key to a booming economy. Humphrey contrasted his programs with Senator McGovern's proposals for "massive defense cuts," which he said "threaten the jobs of millions of working families."

The following is a partial text of Humphrey's remarks to a labor reception at the Retail Clerks Union Hall.

"... Together we've fought for Medicare, woman's rights, for adequate minimum wages, fair labor practices, job safety, for social security, job security and civil rights.

"... We need an end to sex discrimination in this country, there must be equal pay for equal work, and equal opportunity for promotion... we can have women in positions of responsibility at all levels.

"... We need a program of one million public service jobs. Government can be the employer of first opportunity as well as last resort.

"... This program will have a special focus on the unemployed--Vietnam Veteran and the out of work former defense workers.

"... I have proposed a program of 250,000 youth jobs. And jobs directly for construction and commerce in the community.

"... I favor and support the investment tax credit. This is a job producing tax device. It means growth, And growth means jobs.

"... Senator McGovern's mass ax, defense cuts would threaten the jobs of millions of working families.

"... George McGovern would cut the muscle from our security. America will become a second-class power. And without jobs, you will become second class citizens.

"... People don't want welfare--they want jobs. Working families want a fair tax system.

"... McGovern's idea of tax reform is to take away your $750 tax exemption for members of your family, payments on your mortgage and your property tax deduction, to pay for $1000 welfare giveaway.

"... I want a job program that puts people to work--that uses their talents, that has them earning a paycheck. We don't want a McGovern recession on top of the Nixon recession."
BURLINGAME, June 2--Senator Hubert H. Humphrey said today his opponent's voting record on labor issues coupled with his proposals for slashing the defense budget and his "giveaway welfare program" demonstrate that "he is not a real friend of the millions of working families in this state."

Humphrey told a predominately labor audience at a rally at Plumber's Auditorium here:

"A real friend of California working families would not have a record with votes against unemployment compensation, votes against civil rights, votes against organized labor and votes against tax reform. That's part of Senator McGovern's record that he's not telling the people of this state...."

"No real friend of the working family would propose a tax reform program and then run full page ads in the Wall Street Journal telling the big banks and brokerage houses that he really didn't mean it...."

"No real friend of working families would propose programs which threaten their jobs and put people out of work. Yet that's what Senator McGovern's meat ax defense cuts would accomplish."

Following is the text of Senator Humphrey's prepared remarks:

"The labor unions of this nation have a proud history. And I'm proud that we've fought together for dignity and decency for the working families of America."

"Together we've fought for Medicare, for adequate minimum wages, fair labor practices, for job safety, for Social Security for a fair tax system, for job security and for civil rights."

"Together we believe in a healthy, booming American economy and have fought for it."

"Whenever you need Hubert Humphrey, he is there."

"Today, Senator McGovern is telling California working families that he is their friend."

"But you and I know what a real friend is."

"I say he is a false friend of the millions of working families in this state."

(more)
You and I know that a real friend of California working families would not vote against unemployment compensation, against civil rights against organized labor and against tax reform. That's part of Senator McGovern's record that he's not telling the people of this state.

No real friend of working families would propose a welfare scheme that would give everyone $1,000 dollars. That's what Senator McGovern wants. That means that George McGovern wants to give Howard Hughes, the President of ITT and Ronald Reagan a $1,000 handout.

Senator McGovern refuses to tell us how much it will cost. But I can tell you, it can't cost less than $51 billion dollars.

And you're going to be saddled with a McGovern welfare tax to pay for his $1,000 giveaway scheme.

People don't want welfare—they want jobs.

No real friend of the working family would propose a tax reform program and then run full page ads in the Wall Street Journal telling the big banks and brokerage houses that he really didn't mean it.

Yet, that's what Senator McGovern did.

And, he wants to do something else, also. His idea of tax reform is to take away your $750 tax exemption for members of your family, to take away your deductions for interest payments on your mortgage and your property tax deduction.

Think of it—taking your personal exemption and your deduction to pay for the McGovern $1,000 welfare giveaway.

I haven't given up on tax reform. I've been fighting the big boys all my life. I don't run full page ads in the Wall Street Journal apologizing to the big banks and the giant corporations.

I want a fair tax system—one that gives a break to the working man.

No real friend of working families would propose programs which threaten their jobs and put people out of work. Yet, that's what Senator McGovern's meat ax defense cuts would accomplish.

Did you know that George McGovern wants to cut the defense budget by 43 percent?

That means no new shipbuilding. It means closing 25 percent of our army bases, cutting the number of bombers by 60 per cent, cutting half of our fleet, and reducing civilian and military personnel in our Armed Forces by as much as 30 per cent.

George McGovern would cut the muscle from our security. American will become a second class power. And without a job, you will become a second class citizen.

Senator McGovern admitted that California workers may have to be without jobs for as long as a year under his proposals. And this week he appointed a special committee to study the whole situation and find out exactly how many people would lose their jobs.

I'm here to tell Senator McGovern that we don't need any more phony committees. We need people on the job with cash in their wallets.

Californians want jobs, not unemployment compensation. That's why I've proposed a comprehensive job development program to put Californians to work.

You and I know that no real friend of working families would every ignore young workers: and their problems.
But Senator McGovern does.

Young workers are only 3 per cent of George McGovern's California delegation. In the Humphrey youth delegation, they represent 30 per cent.

George McGovern says that he represents the youth of America. But where is the evidence of his commitment to young working families?

I'm here to tell you today that if a young Humphrey supporter doesn't ring your doorbell, it's because he or she is working.

Humphrey youth work for a living and can be found in the factories, in the shops, in the stores of California.

I won't forget the invisible, working youth of this country.

I haven't done so in a political campaign, as Senator McGovern has in this, and I won't do it from the White House.

I'm running hard in California because I refuse to stand idly by and let the Nixon recession become the McGovern recession.

-IIIHI-
HUMPHREY SAYS McGOVERN HAS BLEMISHED CIVIL RIGHTS RECORD

PASADENA, California, June 4-Senator Hubert H. Humphrey said tonight that his opponent in the California primary has a blemished record on civil rights and said that the black community "needs a friend that will be there when the going gets roughs".

In remarks prepared for delivery at the Revelation Baptist Church here, Senator Humphrey said that while he was guiding President John Kennedy's civil rights bill through Congress in 1964, "my opponent, Senator McGovern was still siding with the anti-civil rights forces in the Senate of the United States."

Following is the text of the Senator's prepared remarks:

"There are two candidates in this primary who claim to be the friend of black voters and other minorities in the United States.

My opponent claims that his record on civil rights is as good as mine. This is nonsense.

Sixteen years after I had taken the lead in the battle for human rights in America at the Democratic National Convention of 1948, and while I was guiding John Kennedy's civil rights bill through Congress in 1964, my opponent, Senator George McGovern was still siding with the anti-civil rights forces in the Senate of the United States.

I charge tonight, that on the key voting rights provision of the 1964 civil rights bill, Senator McGovern yielded to political pressure and sided with the Thurmonds of the United States Senate, to stop the progress for human rights in the United States.

I charge the record shows that on June 15, 1964, Senator McGovern joined 22 other senators, which included 18 members of the Senate's hard core anti-civil rights bloc, in voting against a provision to allow the attorney general to require that all courts expedite legal complaints on voting rights. This was a brazen and full scale attempt to emasculate the voting rights provision of the civil rights act.

I challenge Senator McGovern to deny to any black or Mexican American or any other progressive group in the state of California that he did not cast this vote.

This provision was to protect the voting rights of black Americans in the deep South. It may not have been crucial to you here, but it was crucial to our brothers and sisters in Alabama and Mississippi, who had been denied the right to vote by terror, subterfuge, deception and in some cases, outright murder.

I dare Senator McGovern to deny this vote.

What the black community needs, and let's face it, brothers and sisters, is a friend that will stick by them when the going gets rough.

Because no one needs to tell us that the problems that affect all Americans today, affects black Americans with particular harshness. Recession for white folks means depressions for black folks. And you know it.

More than anything else, the tragedy of the Republican recession is that the great economic strides made by black Americans has slowed to a crawl.
Since the Nixon Administration took office, black unemployment has increased by 104 percent. One-half of black youth are without work. How many more will be out of luck, out of money, and out of a job this summer? Black female unemployment is over 50 percent.

At least 100,000 black youth have given up looking for work out of sheer desperation.

The dollar gap between black and white families now amounts to $3,600.00, and it is not being closed under this Administration. To be black and lucky enough to have a job, often means:

- Fewer hours of work per week
- Less pay
- Fewer prospects for advancement
- And first to be fired

We all know that most black paychecks are less than white paychecks. But we also know that there are no special discounts for black families—at the supermarket, at the clothing and appliance stores, and when tax bills come due.

**HEALTH**

It is time to end the unfair gap between white health and black health in America.

The life expectancy of white male is 67 years. The black male is expected to live only 60 years.

Out of every 1,000 babies born, 19 white babies die, but 34 black babies die.

Do you realize that T.B. kills 3 times as many blacks as white?

We rank 18th among the nations of the world in infant mortality. And, finally, this nation has begun to recognize and do something about sickle cell anemia—a dread disease which afflicts black Americans.

I give my solemn pledge that a Humphrey Administration will pull out all the stops to cure this disease.

**CRIME**

It's time to drive the drug pushers from our communities. They have been in our neighborhoods, in our schools, and on the street corners too long.

It's a fact, and everybody ought to know it: black people get hurt most by crime.

Black people ought to be able to walk to church on Sunday without fear.

Black children should never have to fear being shook down on the way to school.

The statistics are stark:

- Blacks suffer 4 times as much robbery as whites; 2 times as much aggravated assault; 2 times as much burglary; and 3 times as much forceable rape.

It is so bad that people are afraid to go crosstown to visit relatives because they fear things they saved and paid for will be stolen.

There is a direct link between crime, drugs, and lack of jobs for our young.
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HUMPHREY TO ANSWER CALIFORNIANS' QUESTIONS ON HOUR-LONG ELECTION-EVE TV PHONE-IN SHOW TO BE AIRED LIVE IN NINE CALIFORNIA CITIES

LOS ANGELES, June 4 -- Senator Hubert H. Humphrey will answer the telephoned questions of California voters in an hour-long live television program Monday night over a special nine-station hookup.

The program will be aired from 8 p.m. to 9 p.m.

The format of the "Ask Hubert Humphrey" program will be similar to that used in a half-hour statewide telecast last Friday night. Viewers will dial a telephone number announced on the broadcast and question Humphrey directly on live TV.

In addition to the nine TV stations, 32 cable television systems will also carry the live program. These systems reach an estimated 1,700,000 viewers.

The television broadcast stations airing the show are:

Bakersfield KJTV
Chico/Redding KRCR-TV
Eureka KVIQ-TV
Fresno KJTV
Los Angeles KTLA-TV
Sacramento KCRA-TV
Salinas/Monterey KST-TV
San Diego KOGO-TV
San Francisco KBHK-TV

33/72 6/4/72 -HHH-
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

BOGUS NEWS RELEASES ISSUED ON HUMPHREY LETTERHEAD, DENOUNCED BY TOP HUMPHREY AIDE

LOS ANGELES, June 5--Bogus news releases on Humphrey for President letterheads appeared throughout California today in an apparent last-minute effort to confuse voters and the news media. Humphrey for President Campaign Manager Jack Chestnut denounced the two bogus releases as "the lowest kind of dirty politics."

One release purported to signify Humphrey support for Proposition 9, an antipollution proposition on the June 6 ballot.

"Senator Humphrey has not spoken for or against Proposition 9, nor has anyone in his campaign organization," said Chestnut. "We have put out no news release. What has appeared on editors' desks this morning is bogus and does not emanate from the Humphrey campaign."

The other release mentioned Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm, who is also in the Democratic Presidential Primary ballot, in a derogatory manner. "This release is completely false. It does not come from the Humphrey campaign," Chestnut said. "Like the other release, it is spurious and bogus."

Chestnut noted that the mimeograph paper supply cabinet in the Humphrey campaign headquarters had been rifled during the evening of June 4 and that several reams of news release paper apparently been stolen.

HHH
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HUFPHREY FOR PRESIDENT NEWS RELEASE
4015 Wilshire Blvd., Los Angeles
380-2600

CONTACT: Jack McDonald
FOR RELEASE--SPM Monday, June 5, 1972

HUMPHREY HITS DIFFERENCES WITH
OPPONENT ON JOBS, DEFENSE, WELFARE

SAN DIEGO, June 5--Senator Hubert H. Humphrey hammered away at the
issues of jobs, defense and welfare today and said that the choice in
the California primary is "between George McGovern who wants to cut your
jobs, and Hubert Humphrey, who wants to keep you working."

In remarks prepared for delivery at a rally here, Senator Humphrey
said the choice is "between two men who differ on the best way to put
this Nation back to work and get our country and the State of California
back on its feet."

Following is the text of the Senator's prepared remarks:

"I'm here to tell the voters of San Diego that they have an important
choice to make tomorrow when they vote in the Democratic primary.
It's a choice between two men who differ on the best way to put
this nation back to work and get our country and the State of California
back on its feet.
It's a difference between George McGovern who wants to cut your
jobs, and Hubert Humphrey, who wants to keep you working.

Senator McGovern has proposed a defense cutback program which threatens
the economic health and the jobs of people who live and work in the San
Diego area.

Senator McGovern proposes halting all further building of naval
surface ships. He says that "no further construction is necessary."
What will this do to the shipyard here in San Diego? How many
thousands of people will be tossed out of work?

Senator McGovern also proposes that we mothball 9 aircraft carriers,
100 cruisers, frigates, and destroyers, and reduce the total number of
submarines by 11.

What does this mean?
It means threatening 6,710 civilian jobs at North Island Naval Air
Rework Facility, 2,114 civilian jobs at the Naval Air Station, 1608 jobs
at San Diego Naval Electronics Lab., 1,000 civilian jobs at San Diego
Naval Supply Center, and thousands more civilian and military jobs at
Imperial Beach, San Diego Naval Station, Coronado, and at the Naval
Training Center.
It means a cutback in commerce for the retail business of this area.
And, it means that the Nixon recession here in San Diego could
become the McGovern recession throughout the state of California.

There is a difference between Humphrey and McGovern on welfare.
Senator McGovern has proposed a massive welfare scheme that will
give $1,000 to everyone in the United State—including Ronald Reagan and
Howard Hughes.
But, he won't tell us how much his $1,000 welfare giveaway scheme
will cost.
But, I'll tell you one thing—it will cost you plenty.
There will be a new McGovern tax to pay for welfare.
If you are now making $8,000 and are single, the McGovern welfare
scheme will mean your taxes will increase $567.00.
For a family of four, making $12,000 a year, the McGovern welfare
tax will mean a tax increase of $409.
I say that is intolerable. The working families of this nation have
carried the load all too long.

MORE
I think that people do not want welfare-- they want jobs. That's what I have proposed--a job program--to put America back to work.

I don't believe that the working families of California can afford more taxes to pay for a welfare $1,000 giveaway scheme.

And, I believe that the working families of California are opposed to Senator McGovern's plan to take away their $750 personal exemption, their medical deductions, their interest rate deductions, and property tax deductions--just to pay for his $1,000 giveaway scheme.

That's not reforming the tax system. That's not closing tax loopholes. That's not making the big boys pay their fair share. That's robbing the working families of America.

I think I know what the people of this state want. And, I have the ability, the know-how, and the experience to translate wants and dreams into reality.

I've got a record that can't be matched by any man in public life. I want to be president. I want to get this nation back to work. And, I need your help.
Humphrey or McGovern--it's the difference between having a job or looking for work...it's the difference between being able to pay the bills or borrowing from the credit companies."

Following is the text of the Senator's prepared remarks:

I'm glad to be here to see this mock-up of the space shuttle. I'm proud to have played a role in protecting your jobs. I've supported the development of the space shuttle. I believe it is important to the technological advancement of the United States. But more importantly, I believe that men and women should be working, rather than looking for work.

Senator McGovern is against the space shuttle. He is recorded against your jobs and your families. Humphrey or McGovern--it's the difference between having a job or looking for work. Humphrey or McGovern--it's the difference between paying the bills or borrowing from the credit companies. Humphrey or McGovern--it's the difference between 24,000 space shuttle jobs in California or the same number of people in the unemployment lines. And it's the difference between saving 56,000 non-aerospace jobs created by the shuttle outside these plant gates in your communities.

I want people to be working. I don't want people on welfare. That's why I'm against Senator McGovern's meat axe defense cuts, and that's why I'm against Senator McGovern's welfare give-away scheme to hand everyone, Ronald Reagan and Howard Hughes included, a $1,000 welfare check. I'm opposed to that scheme. I know who will end up paying for this $1,000 give-away scheme--you will--the working families of this state. There will be a new tax increase--the McGovern welfare tax. I want jobs--not welfare for people. I'm the one candidate who votes to protect your jobs. I don't want any more Californians collecting unemployment compensation. I don't want plants to close. I don't want communities to die.
And I refuse to cast a vote or propose programs that will throw you out of work.

There's a great deal of talk today about having aerospace companies stop building planes and rockets and start building subway cars. I believe companies should be thinking ahead to the manufacture of environmental protection systems, modernized housing units and redesigning our cities. Since 1968, I've been involved in a meaningful practical program of economic conversion.

I've worked to forge the kind of program that isn't pie in the sky. I want a conversion program that puts people to work immediately—not in one or two years.

I think we have a solid plan now with the community conversion corporation proposals. And I believe it will pass the Senate shortly.

I'm proud of my association with the working men and women of the aerospace industry. We are using our technology to move ahead—not just to raise the standard of living, but to improve the quality of life for all Americans. That's what the space shuttle means to me.

That's why I voted for your jobs.
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FOR RELEASE -- p.m., Monday, June 5, 1972

HUMPHREY SCORES CIVIL RIGHTS RECORD OF NIXON, McGOVERN

OAKLAND, CALIF., June 5--Senator Hubert H. Humphrey today criticized the civil rights records of both President Nixon and Senator McGovern and pledges to continue the fight to secure full rights and opportunities for all Americans.

"What people in the black community needs," Humphrey told a rally audience here, "is a friend that will stick by them when the going gets rough."

In his prepared remarks, Humphrey said that the key voting rights provision of the 1964 Civil Rights Bill, "Senator McGovern yielded to political pressure and sided with the Thurmonds of the Senate to stop the progress for human rights in the United States.

"I charge the record shows that on June 15, 1964, Senator McGovern joined 22 other Senators, which included 18 members of the Senate's hard core anti-civil rights bloc, in voting against a provision to allow the attorney general to require that all courts expedite legal complaints on voting rights.

"This was a brazen and full scale attempt to emasculate the voting rights provision of the Civil Rights Act.

"I challenge Senator McGovern to deny to any black or any Mexican American or to anyone else in the State of California that he did not cast this vote."

Humphrey said the problems that affect all Americans today "affect black Americans with particular harshness.

"Recessions for white folks mean depressions for black folks--and you know it.

"More than anything else, the tragedy of the Republican recession is that the great economic strides made by black Americans has slowed to a crawl.

"Since the Nixon Administration took office, black unemployment has increased by 104 per cent.

---More---
"One half of black youth is without work. How many more will be out of luck, out of money, and out of a job this summer? "Employment among black women is over 50 per cent. "At least 100,000 black youths have given up looking for work out of desperation.

"The dollar gap between black and white family annual earnings now amounts to $3,600, and it is not being closed under this Administration. Humphrey also scored the Administration's record on health care and crime control.

"I want for black Americans, for all members of minority groups in our Nation, exactly what I want for myself and for my family--equal rights, full opportunity, quality education, decent housing, freedom from fear on the streets, jobs with dignity and a chance to progress. I have a proven record of fighting for these things. We have won many battles. Many are yet to be won. I ask the opportunity to lead in that endeavor."
We had a great victory in the state of California, and on the basis of what I see here tonight and what I've seen for the last few days in every part of this state, I think we're going to have a great victory a week from tonight (in New York). (Applause)

Ever since that California primary I've been reading in the press that I should move to the center. Well here I am (in the center of the crowd). You can't get any more in the center than this. (Laughter and applause)

The American people are not looking for a leader who moves to the center, who moves to the middle, who moves to the left, who moves to the right. They're looking first and foremost for someone to lead this country, who will take a position, who will take a stand on what he honestly believes, and then hold to that course in the interest of truth and decency and respect for the American people. (Applause)

I think we have had too much in recent years of the politics of manipulation. We've had too much of the politics of expediency. We've had too much political judgment of this country based on narrow, selfish short-term interest, and not enough based on what is in the long-term interest of the great body of the American people.

Four years ago, there was a man seeking the Presidency of the United States who said that any candidate running in 1968, if elected to the Presidency, who could not end that war in his first term should not be re-elected. And I agree with that judgment. (Applause)

I heard the television address the night candidate Nixon told us that he had a secret plan. He said he didn't want to disrupt the Paris peace talks by describing his plan in the heat of a political campaign, but once that campaign was over, he would announce a plan for ending the war. As far as I'm concerned, about the only thing we can say with reference to that pledge is that Mr. Nixon is one man who really knows how to keep a secret. (Applause)

And the President now claims, after another 20,000 Americans have died these past 3½ years, after scores of additional young Americans have been captured and placed in prison in Hanoi, after tens of thousands of innocent people have been killed and maimed by the destruction of our bombs and our artillery, after we opened our papers last week to see little children running naked from a school that has just been napalmed -- and that gives us some measure of the barbarism and destruction of this war -- the President now insists month after month that the war is winding down.

But last week, a strange thing happened on Capitol Hill. The Secretary of Defense, testifying in preparation for fiscal year 1973, which begins on the first of July, told us that we would need to fight the war in Vietnam between $3 and 5 billion more than we've spent in the current fiscal year.

Now if the war is winding down, why do we need $5 billion more in the coming year to fight that war than we've spent in the year that's about to end? Is the war winding down, or are preparations being made for an even more devastating and bloody attack in the months ahead?

Why is it that some months ago the Pentagon stopped public reports on the number of American sorties flown over North Vietnam and flown over other parts of the Indochina peninsula? Why is it we are suddenly confronted with the news that the war in the next twelve months will cost from $3 to 5 billion more than the past twelve months?

This is scarcely a redemption of an election pledge of four years ago. It is a verification, I think, of the President's own statement that a man who can't end the war in four years does not deserve to be re-elected. (Applause)

Now I want to give President Nixon credit where credit is due. He has opened relations with China and I praised that initiative regarding this largest of all countries. I applaud his recent efforts in Moscow to arrive at some mutual agreement for the reduction of the arms burden on both of our countries.
But what are we to say about the credibility of the administration when the President comes back from Moscow announcing that he has just negotiated a reduction in the arms race, and then Secretary Laird a few days later -- in the same press conference to which I have just referred -- announces that we will have to spend $2 or $3 billion more on the arms race next year than we spent in the current year?

Now who are we to believe? Is the arms race being reduced, as the President announced on his return from Moscow, or is it once again accelerating as indicated by Secretary Laird's request?

This, it seems to me, is the serious credibility problem that is at the basis of the crisis in confidence in American public life today. (Applause)

Then there's another serious development in the last few days that again reflects on the credibility of this administration. On February 7th, the President signed into law a new measure which requires every person running for the Presidency of the United States to disclose publicly the names of, and the amount of money contributed by, everyone backing that particular candidate's campaign.

And we all know the reason why that law was so desperately needed: it is because of the obvious evidence we have had in recent years of the unwholesome influence of special interest money on political decisions all the way from the White House down to the court house.

So when the President signed that law, he hailed it as a historic step forward. He said this signals a new era of moral leadership in the United States, and I'm proud, he said, to sign this law requiring a full disclosure of the names and contributions to national campaigns in this country.

Now it's true that that law did not take effect technically until April 7th. And so what happened? The President's finance director, Maurice Stans, set out on a crash basis to raise every possible dime he could between the time that law was signed on February 7th, and the time it became effective on April 7th.

And ten million dollars was raised in that period of time.

The new law requires that even though you don't name the contributors and the amount of those contributing prior to April 7th, you have at least to list the total amount. So when it came out a few days ago that ten million dollars was contributed prior to April 7th, the reporters of this country very legitimately asked Mr. John Mitchell, the President's campaign chairman, the former Attorney General of the United States, to reveal not as a matter of law, but as a matter of what the President himself described as an act of moral leadership -- the names of those who contributed the ten million dollars.

I didn't wait for any law to do that. I disclosed the name and the contributor of every dollar that has come into this campaign going clear back to January 1971. (Applause)

But what did Mr. Mitchell say? He said the law doesn't require us to reveal the names of contributors and the amounts given prior to April 7th. When he was asked about the moral obligation to do so, he said we had no moral obligation either, and he said, beyond that, there were many people who didn't like to have their contributions publicly known.

Well, how can you have it both ways? How can you have the President of the United States announcing to the Nation on February 7th, that it's a great act of moral leadership to require that the name and the contribution he made public, and then have the former Attorney General, now the President's campaign manager, telling us there's no moral obligation at all to release the names of these ten million dollar contributors to the Republican Party?

I went to say here tonight, not to the Republican Party but to Richard Nixon in his bid for re-election, that I challenge President Nixon directly from this stage. If he is going to wear the mantle of moral and political leadership of this nation, I challenge him to reveal the name of every contributor and the amount of every contribution that has been received since January 1st of 1972. (Applause)
What is it that they're so afraid of? (Voice from audience: "ITT!")

Did you hear what the young man says? Is ITT included in the ten million dollars? Is the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation that got a $250 million dollar loan? (Applause) I think we have a right to know whether corporate interests, whether powerful forces of greed and privilege, are again contributing under the cover of darkness, and who then will be around the day after the election -- if Mr. Nixon is re-elected, which God forbid. (Laughter and applause)

It wears a little bit thin to hear the former Attorney General say the reason they don't want to reveal the names is that some contributors are fearful that it would expose them to requests for charitable contributions. (Applause)

Do you really think it's the Red Cross they're afraid of? (Cheers and applause)

I think we're talking about the most serious single political problem facing this country today and that is the crisis in public confidence, the crisis of trust and believability -- what has come to be known, in that painful phrase, the "credibility gap".

That's just a kind of sophisticated way of saying we're a little short on honesty and decency and truthfulness in politics today, and how much we need to restore in this great country some measure of respect and confidence in each other.

You don't begin a campaign for the Presidency by asking the people to trust the candidate. The candidate begins that process of trust by trusting the people. (Applause)

He trusts them enough to lay here the financial sources of his own campaign. He trusts them enough to take the hard positions on complicated and dangerous issues.

He trusts them enough to speak out on his conscience and what he believes is in the public interest of this nation. (Applause)

So, what kind of a nation then do we want?

We want a nation that stands for peace; we want a nation that will not only end this war but will resolve that never again will we send our young men to die for a corrupt military dictatorship. (Applause)

So let us understand that we have legitimate national interests around the globe; we do have the need for an adequate defense; we must remain alert but we have no obligation to bail out unrepresentative and unrespected dictatorships of the kind we have been backing in Saigon. (Applause)

Secondly, we want the kind of leadership in this country where our president does not tell us one thing in public while secretly planning a different course behind closed doors. (Applause)

And we want a government with such a passion for justice that not even a $400,000 contribution will buy exemption from the antitrust laws for ITT or anyone else. (Applause)

If we truly want to save this country from the specter of giantism, from the growth of conglomerate and corporate power, then the time has come to elect a leadership that can break free from these special interests and enforce the antitrust laws, back up the regulatory agencies and take steps on every question to see that the public interest will be placed ahead of the forces of special interest and greed and privilege that do not need a president to plead their case. (Applause)

I want us to remember that this country began with the great cry: "No taxation without representation!" Translated into modern terms, that means no taxation without justice.

It means that there's something fundamentally wrong with the tax structure that last year permitted 40% of the great corporations of this country to go through the loopholes and get by without paying one single dime in federal income taxes. (Applause)
And it means also that we will develop in this country the kind of law enforcement orientation, the kind of Department of Justice, the kind of FBI, that is less interested in snooping into the private lives of the citizens and more interested in putting hard-drug racketeers and the crime syndicates behind bars. (Applause)

In this great state of New York there are more young people between the ages of 15 and 35 whose lives are being destroyed by hard drugs than by any other single disease that afflicts this nation; and that calls not simply for rhetoric, but for an intelligent and comprehensive effort to crack down in the first instance on the crime syndicates and the drug racketeers, and in the second instance for an intelligent and comprehensive research, educational, and rehabilitation program to deal with these tens of thousands of people addicted to drugs in this state and in other parts of the nation. (Applause)

There's one other thing that I want to say here tonight as we call for this nation to begin moving away from war in the direction of peace, to begin converting the engines of destruction to the works of peace.

I know the job anxiety that arises in the minds not only of our veterans coming back from Vietnam, but in the thoughts of many people all across this country who have come to think that the only way we can sustain employment is with an enormous arms industry or a war of some kind.

I believe with every fiber of my being, that if we will end this war, if we will close the unjustified loopholes in our tax laws and invest those two sources of savings in the construction of housing, in the development of environmental protection programs, in the construction of public transit facilities, in better schools, neighborhood health centers, child development centers -- all of these things that we know our country needs -- I believe that with the same money we are now wasting on war and the money we are now losing needlessly in tax loopholes, we can undertake the kind of works in this country that will provide a fulfilling job for every man and woman in America who wants to work. (Applause)

With all the needs of this society, there's no excuse for aerospace scientists, machinists, technicians and electronic specialists being without jobs. There's no excuse for college graduates to be haunted by the fear that they can't get a job. (Applause)

There's no excuse for these young men coming back from Vietnam to be faced with the specter of unemployment. (Applause) We ought to take steps in this country, we ought to do whatever is necessary, to recognize that there is no greater waste than to permit six or seven million men and women who want to work to be idle, to lose that enormous potential of talent and skill and labor and energy that we need to build this country into the kind of a land we want it to be.

Let me just say in conclusion that I'm aware that in recent years this country has been embarked on such a painful and tragic course abroad, and we have been so deeply troubled here at home, that many of us have forgotten the greatness of America's enduring ideals.

But if we remember that every one of us is the child of a great and free people and we are no less than that, and if we now in 1972 make the decisions and make the effort that will match our performance with the great ideals of this country, than I believe that our children and future generations will love America, not simply because they were born here, but because of the kind of great and good and decent land that you and I together have made it.

Thank you very much. (Applause)
McGovern at WNET was interviewed by a panel of citizens—six people in all—of varying backgrounds. He tangled with Nick Kisburg, legislative director for the teamsters union in New York. During a discussion of his Vietnam position, McGovern said President Eisenhower had estimated 80% of the Vietnamese would have chosen Ho Chi Minh in an election. Kisburg asked him: "Sen., if 80% of the Vietnamese voted against the Communists, would you then be for our troops being there?" Ans.: "It would make a great difference." Kisburg: "Does that mean we made a mistake not going into Czechoslovakia?" Ans.: "Well, if we'd have tried to go into Czech... interruption... Q: Sen., did we make a moral mistake not going into Cz. using your own formula?" Ans.: "I would say no, that we did not make a mistake." Q: "What would you do, Sen., along that same line, if Russian troops invaded Israel?...Would you permit (American) troops?" Ans.: "If that were necessary to save Israel, I would, without question." Q. "But not Cz.?" Are there no Cz. votes in NYS?" Ans.: "There are Cz. votes in NYS, but we had no opportunity to intervene in Cz...."

The exchange was the highlight of the show. McG generally gave pat answers although he told Lucille Buffalino, Pres. of the celebrity Life Committee, and anti-abortion League that he "would veto legislation that had to do with setting aside state jurisdiction over abortion, etc." Ms. Buffalino, the mother of four, held up a large color picture of a bloody aborted fetus. McG refused to be drawn into the issue saying it was "an issue I not only don't want to tangle with, I'm not going to tangle with."
Other panelists were Pearse Meagher, a NY police inspector, who wanted to know about gun control, Robert Wilmers, vp of Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., who asked about tax reform, Salvatore Vacarro, a Bronx construction worker who questioned the welfare plan, and Daniel Brigham, military affairs columnist. Vacarro suggested that McG's Vietnam position represented "running away from the Communists. Mc replied that it was not a world wide Communist effort but an internal Vietnam dispute. He said the US could become stronger and more respected by withdrawing as France from Algeria. "Nobody ever called General DeGaulle a coward when he decided France ought to get out of Algeria...He had the courage to say enough is enough."

Mc made an unscheduled stop at the NY Daily News for a 30-minute session with the editorial board. The News, an upholder of freedom of the press, declined to allow the pool reporters into the editorial dept. to observe the
SENIOR McGOVERN TO VISIT LINDSAY, ADDRESS PUERTO RICANS SATURDAY

Senator George McGovern will pay a courtesy call on Mayor John V. Lindsay at Gracie Mansion and address a rally in East Harlem as he returns to New York City after upstate appearances in Buffalo and Utica on Saturday (June 17).

His complete schedule for Saturday follows [Press-schedule for Saturday afternoon, Sunday and Monday to follow].

9:45 AM BUFFALO
Arrive UAL Hangar by charter from Washington, Greater Buffalo International Airport.

10:00 AM BUFFALO
Outdoor gathering, Broadway Market, 990 Broadway (Senator appears about 10:30).

12:10 PM BUFFALO
Depart Greater Buffalo International for Utica.

1:10 PM UTICA
Arrive Oneida County Airport, Allegheny Maintenance Hangar, Utica.

1:30 PM UTICA
Outdoor gathering, New Hartford Shopping Center, Genesee Street (New Hartford.) Senator appears about 1:50.

3:00 PM UTICA
Depart Oneida County Airport for NYC.

3:50 PM NEW YORK
Arrive Marine Air Terminal, LaGuardia Airport, depart by bus for Gracie Mansion.

4:30 PM NEW YORK
Pay courtesy call on Mayor Lindsay, Gracie Mansion.

Followed by press briefing on front lawn.

5:00 PM NEW YORK
Press bus departs Gracie Mansion for East Harlem.

5:10 PM NEW YORK

5:20 PM NEW YORK
Address outdoor gathering [Begins at 4:30]. 116th Street & Lexington Ave.

5:50 PM NEW YORK
Press bus departs for Biltmore, Madison 43rd.

8:45 PM NEW YORK
Press bus departs Biltmore for synagogue.

9:00 PM NEW YORK
Address supporters [Begins at 8:33] on Israel and the Middle East at Shaaray Tefila Synagogue, 250 E. 79th St. (near 2nd Ave.).

9:45 PM NEW YORK
Press bus departs synagogue for Biltmore.
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FOR RELEASE A.M. SUNDAY
June 18, 1972

CONTACT: Dick Cohen

SENATOR MCGOVERN HITS NIXON ADMINISTRATION ON ISRAEL POLICY

Senator George McGovern last night criticized President Nixon's Middle East policy, charging that "the danger to Israel has increased" since Mr. Nixon took office.

In remarks prepared for delivery at 9 P.M., Saturday at Temple Shaaray Tefila, a Reform congregation on the Upper East Side (250 E. 79th St.), McGovern said: "When the present administration took office, the President called the Middle East 'the most critical foreign policy problem after Vietnam,'" McGovern said. "Yet the Middle East is no closer to peace today than it was then--and the danger to Israel, in many respects, has increased."

Charging the State Department under Mr. Nixon with reversing previous policy and trying to impose a settlement through a concert of outside powers, Sen. McGovern said only direct negotiations between the parties involved, "without preconditions," can bring peace to the area.
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The full text of Senator McGovern's remarks are attached.
A SECURE ISRAEL -- AN AMERICAN GOAL

Text of address by Senator George McGovern

Temple Shaaray Tefila
250 East 79th Street
New York, New York
9 PM, Saturday, June 17, 1972

When Israel became a nation, I rejoiced, along with all Americans. My wife and I have visited Israel on several occasions. She has gone on archeological digs in the Negev. In my meetings with Prime Minister Meir, with General Dayan and with Ambassador Rabin, I have gained an understanding of their problems, and a growing respect for their vision and determination. Over the last quarter of a century, I have watched how the people of Israel, though harassed on every side, have made the desert bloom and the cities grow, and welcomed the oppressed from all the world. Israel has meant new life. In a troubled area of the globe, it is a shining light of progress and freedom. And I have always believed that if American might and American influence are to be on the side of freedom and peace, they must be on the side of insuring the security and independence of the State of Israel.

I am proud to say these beliefs have been reflected in my public record. I have supported every legislative effort to give military and economic assistance to Israel since I came to Congress in 1957. In addition, I have on several occasions urged hesitant administrations, both Democratic and Republican, to sell Israel the equipment required for her defense. And I have opposed military aid to other Middle Eastern countries when I felt it could be used for military activities against Israel.

I am proud also to have built a reputation as a spokesman for peace. In a world like ours, peace requires ending wrong commitments and maintaining the right ones. Being for peace does not mean being weak, or naive, or afraid of confrontation. Being for peace means willing to assume responsibilities to nations threatened by aggression, being willing to help nations working for peace and justice, and knowing where the real interest of the United States lies.

That is why I have always been disturbed by those who say it is inconsistent for America to assist Israel while withdrawing from the quagmire of Vietnam.

Israel is not Vietnam. It is, in fact, the very opposite of Vietnam. The government of Saigon is a corrupt dictatorship which long ago lost the support of its people. Israel is a democratic nation, whose elected leadership has as firm a support among her people as any government in the world. Vietnam is an internal struggle. Israel is protecting herself against the threat of armed aggression from hostile outside powers.

- MORE -
Southeast Asia is not essential to the economy and the security of the United States. The Middle East is. The government of Saigon is not interested in a peace settlement with its adversaries. Israeli leaders are. But most important, the Israelis have never, and will never, ask for a single American soldier to come and fight in their defense.

When the present Administration took office, the President called the Middle East the "most critical foreign policy problem after Vietnam." Yet the Middle East is no closer to peace today than it was then -- and the danger to Israel, in many respects, has increased.

Secretary Rogers and the State Department reversed the policy of the previous Administration and tried to impose a settlement through a concert of outside powers. This effort not only failed, it helped stoke up the arms race, strengthened the forces of aggression and terrorism; and made it far more difficult for the Israelis to gain acceptance for the only kind of negotiations which can bring peace: direct negotiations, without preconditions, between the nations of the Middle East themselves.

Our basic goal in the Middle East should be to maintain the peace. But what is crucial is the kind of peace we should be seeking. Not an unsteady quiet, maintained by a combination of Israel military superiority and Arab disunity, punctuated by incidents of terrorism and threatened by a dangerous inflow of arms. We want a permanent peace, based on genuine reconciliation and mutual respect between neighbors. I hope and pray that some day a leader of an Arab nation will be courageous enough, and concerned enough for his own people, to state publicly and unequivocally, "We must live in peace with Israel."

But until these magic words are spoken and true reconciliation begins, we must follow policies that avoid further bloodshed, and improve the chances for eventual reconciliation.

In my view, the cornerstone of our policies in the Middle East should be the survival of an Israel that is militarily secure, politically democratic and economically sound. And the cornerstone of any peace settlement must be a mutual agreement upon defensible and recognized national boundaries capable of deterring any future aggression.

All three Israel - Arab wars -- in 1948, 1956 and 1967 -- can be traced to the arbitrary and erratic lines drawn as Israel's temporary boundaries. These boundaries, because of their tempting vulnerability, were invitations to armed invasion and maritime blockade. The 1949 lines, it is worth recalling, resulted from Arab invasions and Israel's response.

Israel has stated its readiness to enter into negotiations without prior conditions, and has expressed its willingness to withdraw from the present ceasefire lines to new boundaries which the negotiators would agree upon in a treaty of peace. The actions of the United States can be crucial in advancing the day that peace can be achieved in line with these principles.

I see four major areas in which the United States can assert itself as a force for peace in the Middle East.
First: The most effective guarantee of both the present cease-fire, and of a permanent peace, is the modern military deterrent of the Israeli armed forces. Where we have hesitated in our military support of Israel, the fragile fabric of peace has been weakened. When we have supplied this help, conditions have stabilized. At a time of massive Soviet arms shipments of the most modern available equipment to other states, we have an obligation to furnish Israel the advanced aircraft and other equipment necessary to prevent attack. Our sale of these weapons should not be made contingent upon Israeli agreement to American diplomatic demands. It should be an ongoing commitment based solely upon the military requirements of the day.

Second: Israel needs substantial economic aid. It has, of hard necessity, the largest per capita defense budget in the free world. Yet it must continue to provide for refugees from the Soviet Union and elsewhere. Much of Israel's economic aid is supplied by people like yourselves. But our government can do more than it has. In this connection, I have proposed an $85 million program, from available refugee funds, to help defray the costs of settling new immigrants from the Soviet Union.

Third: Israel needs our diplomatic support, in support of her basic peace proposals and her present policies in the arenas of diplomacy, including the United Nations. I was distressed when the United States joined in voting criticism of Israeli administration of Jerusalem. In the last twenty centuries, Jerusalem has never seen better rule than it sees today under the Israeli administration of Mayor Kollek. The people have jobs -- Arabs and Jews. Health care is available to all. The holy places of all religions are fully protected and under repair. The people of Jerusalem have gained from Israel administration and should continue under it. Furthermore, the United States should recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and move our embassy there.

Fourth: Israel needs our help in restraining Soviet activity in the Middle East. For fifteen years, the Soviets have fished in the troubled waters of the Eastern Mediterranean. Their weapons and the stationing of their own personnel present a difficult obstacle to negotiations. I would hope that, in the new period of negotiation that has opened up with the Soviet Union, we might do what we can to persuade them to join with us to encourage the kind of non-imposed settlement that would take the Middle East out of the theatre of big-power confrontation.

Next year is the 25th Anniversary of Israeli independence. I intend, on that occasion, to be the first American President ever to visit Israel while in office. I want to see the Negev; to relive the story of Masada; to tour the Galilee; to see the great port of Haifa; and to stand at the Western Wall at Friday sundown. I want to join in the work of peace in that area of the world, as in others. And I want to tell the people of Israel that Americans stand with them in their work of development, and their determination to survive.

For when the Lord sent Abraham into a land "flowing with milk and honey", he did not mean to turn it into a desert of backwardness or destruction. He chose his people well, and now that fate and tragedy and hope have led them back to their land, it is our job to help them stay there.
The following is a statement made today by Senator George McGovern:

"I note in the morning paper that President Nixon's closest economic adviser has just fired the opening shot of this year's campaign against me for the Administration in Washington.

Nixon obviously realizes that this year's Presidential campaign is going to be waged primarily over the rampant unemployment, inflation, economic uncertainty and favoritism which now burden this country.

He inherited some of the problems - but he has seriously further aggravated all of them. And he has caused billions of dollars of new problems and special benefits and bail-outs for the super-rich.

With the sudden attack on me this week-end, he has now tipped his hand that he is going to try to distract and cover up with the kind of political hatchet work which has characterized every campaign he has ever run.

I don't think the American people will be fooled by that.

Unemployment persists at around 6% despite all the controls and gimmicky the Administration has unsuccessfully tried this year.

Inflation eats away at the pocketbook of every American. And the press reported just a few days ago that meat and other food prices are about to soar again even though the consumer and farmer are both already being shortchanged.

Wage controls are squeezing the American working man and woman. But price controls are not bothering the big corporations at all, as Administration officials privately concede. Corporate profits, for instance, soared to an all-time high in the first quarter of this year.

The only consistent thing about the Nixon administration in the last year is its economic favoritism in support of the big concentrations of wealth and power in this country. That is evident in Nixon's major economic policies as well as in its persistent refusal to help close the gaping tax loopholes which favor I.T.T., the oil industry and other economic giants.

There is irony in the President's chief economic adviser launching the Administration's attack on me before a bankers' convention. But it was about the only honest part of the whole performance.

Well, let me make clear to Richard Nixon that I welcome a full economic debate. I believe the overwhelming majority of Americans - middle-class, working-class, and less well-off groups - are fed up with his trickle-down attitude of corporations-first, people-last.

And I predict the economic failures and favoritism of the Nixon administration, as those put in bread-and-butter terms the injustices and unfairness of so many Nixon policies, will be the main grist of this year's Presidential campaign."
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

WEST SIDE CITIZENS TO HOLD RALLY FOR SENATOR MCGOVERN ON SATURDAY

Former Senator Ernest Gruening (Alaska), Congresswoman Bella Abzug and Congressman William F. Ryan will be the featured speakers at a rally for the McGovern slates of delegates from the 19th and 20th congressional districts on Saturday, June 17 from 1:00-3:00 p.m. at 72nd Street and Broadway.

Other speakers will include: David Amram, musician; Helayne Baron, district leader; Albert H. Blumenthal, assemblyman; Richard N. Gottfried, assemblyman; Jack Newfield, journalist; Manfred Ohrenstein, state senator; Reverend Channing Phillips; Beulah Sanders, National Welfare Rights; Piri Thomas, author; Theodore H. Weiss, councilman; and Reed Wolcott, district leader.

The rally is sponsored by West Side Citizens for McGovern.

-30-
PRESS SCHEDULE FOR SENATOR GEORGE McGovern

Saturday - Monday, June 17-19, 1972

SATURDAY, JUNE 17 - MANHATTAN

3:50 PM  NEW YORK  Arrive Marine Air Terminal, LaGuardia Airport
depart by bus for Gracie Mansion.

4:30 PM  MANHATTAN  Pay courtesy call on Mayor John V. Lindsay,
Gracie Mansion.
Informal press briefing on front lawn
immediately following.

5:00 PM  MANHATTAN  Press bus departs Gracie Mansion for East Harlem.

5:10 PM  MANHATTAN  Meet with leaders of Puerto Rican community
and Spanish-speaking press. Pool of two (one
national, one local). McGovern for President
HQ, 219 E. 116th Street, East Harlem.

5:20 PM  MANHATTAN  Address outdoor gathering, 116th Street and
Lexington Avenue, East Harlem. [Begins at
4:30 PM].

5:50 PM  MANHATTAN  Press bus departs for Biltmore, arrives 6:20,
file, dinner.

8:45 PM  MANHATTAN  Press bus departs Biltmore for synagogue.

9:00 PM  MANHATTAN  Speak to supporters on Israel and the Middle
East, Shaaray Tefila Synagogue, 250 East 79th
Street. [Program begins at 8:30].

9:45 PM  MANHATTAN  Press bus departs synagogue for Biltmore.
Overnight. Main no 212/687-7000. Press
room (1420) 212/997-9135. Madison Ave. & 43rd
St.

SUNDAY, JUNE 18 - MANHATTAN, THE BRONX, BROOKLYN

10:30 AM  MANHATTAN  Press bus departs Hotel Biltmore for Harlem.

11:00 AM  MANHATTAN  Attend services and deliver sermon, Metropolitan
Community Methodist Church, 1925 Madison Ave.
(126th-127th St.).

12:30 PM  MANHATTAN  Press bus departs church for The Bronx.

1:10 PM  THE BRONX  Greet area supporters, eat lunch, Castle Hill
Beach Club, 355 Castle Hill Avenue.

2:00 PM  THE BRONX  Press bus departs club for Brooklyn.

3:00 PM  BROOKLYN  Meeting with Rabbi Soloman Halberstan, a
Bobover Rabbi, 1501 48th St. Pool of three.
Lunch on press bus.

3:20 PM  BROOKLYN  Press bus departs for 43rd Street.

3:30 PM  BROOKLYN  Meeting with local rabbis, home of Rabbi
Moshe Joseph Rubin, 1230 43rd St. Pool of three.
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SUNDAY, JUNE 18 (continued)

3:55 PM BROOKLYN Press bus departs meeting for walking tour.

4:00 PM BROOKLYN Walking tour of Borough Park on 13th Avenue from 46th to 49th Streets.

4:45 PM BROOKLYN Press bus departs 13th Ave & 49th St. for Hotel Biltmore, Madison Ave & 43rd St., Manhattan, overnight.

MONDAY, JUNE 19 - QUEENS, BIG FLATS (ELMIRA), ALBANY, ROCHESTER, BUFFALO, NYC

7:30 AM MANHATTAN Press bus departs Biltmore for Flushing, Queens

8:00 AM QUEENS Greet subway riders, Roosevelt Avenue and Main Street, Flushing, Queens.

8:30 AM QUEENS Press bus departs Flushing for airport.

9:00 AM QUEENS Depart Marine Air Terminal, LaGuardia Airport by charter for Big Flats.

9:50 AM BIG FLATS Arrive Chemung County Airport, Southwest Side of Terminal. (Big Flats is near Elmira).

10:00 AM BIG FLATS News Conference, public invited, Chemung County Airport, Southwest Side of Terminal.

10:40 AM BIG FLATS Depart Chemung County Airport by charter for Albany. Lunch aboard plane.

11:45 AM ALBANY Arrive Albany County Airport, Page Airways Terminal, depart by bus for State Capitol.

12 NOON ALBANY Address outdoor gathering, Front Steps, State Capitol, Albany.

1:10 PM ALBANY Press bus departs Capitol for airport.

1:50 PM ALBANY Depart Page Airways Terminal, Albany County Airport by charter for Rochester.

2:20 PM ROCHESTER Arrive Rochester-Monroe County Airport, West side of terminal.

2:30 PM ROCHESTER News conference, public invited, west side of County Airport.

3:10 PM ROCHESTER Depart Rochester-Monroe County Airport by charter for Buffalo.

3:30 PM BUFFALO Arrive Greater Buffalo International, Piror Aviation Hangar.


4:30 PM BUFFALO Depart Greater Buffalo International Airport by charter for New York.

5:30 PM QUEENS Arrive Marine Air Terminal, LaGuardia Airport, depart by bus for Biltmore.

6:30 PM MANHATTAN Reception for area labor leaders, Windsor Room, Hotel Biltmore, Madison Ave & 43rd St.

Overnight at Biltmore.

TUESDAY, JUNE 20 - NEW YORK, NEW ORLEANS, NEW YORK - details to come

Plane reservations or election night credentials: 212/593-8254.
Sunday, June 18, 1972

Immediate Release

From: Lt. Gov. William Dougherty, South Dakota

New York ---- Lt. Governor Bill Dougherty, S.D.
in New York to confer with Sen. George McGovern, today extended an invitation to Mayor John V. Lindsay to visit the Black Hills of South Dakota on his way home from the National Mayors' Conference taking place this week in New Orleans.

"I am inviting Mayor Lindsay, as the head of the nation's largest city, to visit what has been called the most beautiful recreation area in the nation — the Black Hills of South Dakota," Dougherty said after visiting Gracie Manison, the Mayor's official residence, to extend the invitation.

"The recent flood destruction was confined almost entirely to Rapid City," Dougherty noted, "and while it was terrible in its cost to life and property, the heavy sudden rain was one of those once-in-a-century occurrences which the people there are stout-heartedly coping with.

"All the rest of South Dakota has rallied to help Rapid City. But it has also put the welcome mat out for all the Americans who find the Black Hills one of the country's last great natural settings. I can't imagine a lovelier place for the nation's mayors to visit after their week of grappling with the problems of urban congestion, environmental pollution, and the other ills of the great metropolitan centers.

"Out in the wide-open country, we are looking forward to a friendly summer for many thousands of touring Americans. We'd like to show the nation's mayors the Black Hills, Mount Rushmore, and all the other attractions there."
Statement by Senator George McGovern

For immediate release June 19, 1972

I have cancelled my schedule of airport appearances in upstate New York today in order to show my sympathy for the efforts of airline pilots throughout the world to bring an end to the growing epidemic of airplane sabotage and hijacking.

My action is not intended to reflect upon the Chief Justice's order of last evening. American pilots are under court order to fly today. I am not. This is an international crisis, to which the United States has probably responded as well as any other country. Those of us who are not covered by this order should help dramatize the need for action by the international community.

In recent years, the airplane has become a favorite target of blackmailers, demonstrators and political terrorists. Thousands of lives have been threatened and hundreds of lives have been lost. Any disturbed person with a gun in his hand, any political gang, can hold a plane full of people at hostage and disrupt the commerce of whole nations. The recent atrocity at Lydda Airport near Tel Aviv, in which 25 innocent persons were killed, many of them Catholic pilgrims, was but the latest in a long series of atrocities in the air.

All of this has come about because security and inspection procedures at many of the airports of the world are not adequate; and because there are no enforceable international extradition procedures to apprehend and punish the pirates of the air. The airline pilots, who must live with this threat every working day, have tried for years to bring about responsive international action. Their current action is taken not only for
themselves but for all who travel by air.

The Security Council of the United Nations should meet without delay to coordinate action by all countries on this vital matter. It should do everything it can to encourage adoption by all international airports of baggage inspection procedures tight enough to detect weapons and explosives. It should strongly urge all nations to ratify the pending treaty on skyjacking, so that aerial pirates cannot play upon political differences between nations to gain asylum. I am distressed that certain nations are drawing distinctions, in their willingness to cooperate on extradition, between piracy for money and piracy for so-called "political" reasons. Both pose an equal danger to passengers and to the security of the international community.

This is not a strike, but an urgent protest. I regret the inconvenience to those whose travel plans have been disrupted today. But I hope they will see it as a small price to pay for bringing about the day when all of us will be able to travel the airways free from fear.
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

SENATOR McGOVERN TO RIDE SUBWAY TO QUEENS, ADDRESS MAYORS IN NEW ORLEANS, RETURN FOR ELECTION NIGHT TUESDAY

Senator George McGovern will conclude his New York campaign Tuesday with a ride on the IRT Subway to Flushing, Queens, and after a brief trip to New Orleans to address the U.S. Conference of Mayors, return to New York for election night festivities at the Hotel Biltmore.

Senator McGovern's complete schedule for Tuesday, June 20 follows:

8:50 AM MANHATTAN Senator and press walk from 43rd Street entrance of Hotel Biltmore (@ Madison Ave.) to Grand Central Terminal.

9:05 AM MANHATTAN Ride IRT #7 Subway from Grand Central to Roosevelt and Main Sts., Flushing, Queens.

9:40 AM QUEENS Press bus departs Roosevelt and Main Sts., Flushing for airport.

10:15 AM QUEENS Depart Marine Air Terminal, LaGuardia Airport by United 737 charter for New Orleans.

12 NOON NEW ORLEANS Arrive Eastern AL Freight Pad, New Orleans International Airport, depart by bus for City Hall.

12:30 PM NEW ORLEANS Public appearance, steps of City Hall.

12:55 PM NEW ORLEANS Press bus departs City Hall for hotel.

1:15 PM NEW ORLEANS Address U.S. Conference of Mayors, Grand Ballroom, Fairmont Roosevelt Hotel.

1:45 PM NEW ORLEANS Meet with Louisiana delegation to Democratic National Convention, Rm 975, Fairmont-Roosevelt.

2:30 PM NEW ORLEANS Meet with group of mayors, Rm 875, Fairmont-Roosevelt.

3:45 PM NEW ORLEANS Press bus departs hotel for airport.

4:30 PM NEW ORLEANS Depart Eastern AL Freight Pad, New Orleans International Airport by charter for New York.

8:00 PM QUEENS Arrive Marine Air Terminal, LaGuardia Airport, depart by bus for Hotel Biltmore.

EVENING MANHATTAN Election Night activities, Grand Ballroom, 19th Floor, Hotel Biltmore, Madison Ave. & 43rd Sts. Overnight at Biltmore.

# # # # # # # # # #

Plane reservations to New Orleans or Election Night Credentials: 593-8254. All press should pick up credentials for election night, beginning at 5:30 PM Tuesday in West (press) Room, 19th Floor.
MEMO TO: Editors, News Directors, Assignments Desks
FROM: McGovern Press Office
RE: Election Night Coverage and Credentials

The McGovern campaign will be headquartered election night (Tuesday, June 20) at the Hotel Biltmore. The main activity will occur in the Grand Ballroom on the 19th Floor.

The enclosed diagram and this memo should serve to clarify the election night coverage arrangements.

PRESS FACILITIES

TELEVISION: Platforms will be provided in the center of the ballroom floor about 30 feet from the stage for both live and reel cameras. The networks are providing the lighting and sound pools. Live cameras will be positioned on the forward platform, reel cameras directly behind on a slightly more elevated platform.

LIVE RADIO: Audio outlets planning live coverage will be positioned along the south wall (stage left) in the area near the stage. Communications must be secured directly through the phone company. Each outlet will be assigned six feet of table space, if necessary. The McGovern campaign will provide a patchbox.

TAPED RADIO: Audio outlets planning taped coverage will be positioned in the south balcony directly above the live radio area. The McGovern campaign will provide a patchbox and seven phones. Audio outlets desiring their own phones should order directly from the phone company.

IMPORTANT NOTE TO RADIO: No microphones can be placed on the podium. The McGovern campaign will provide patches.

PRINT PRESS: Legitimate print press will be positioned in the balcony -- the latter two-thirds of the south side and the entire north side. Seven phones are available on the south side and 10 on the north side. The phone company will install additional phones on the spot if necessary. A limited number of typewriters will also be available.

PHOTOGRAPHERS: Photographers from the wire services, daily newspapers and weekln news magazines, while free to roam anywhere, will be provided a roped-off area directly in front of the stage for easy access to the Senator.

ALL PRESS: Except for the balcony and the stage front photo area, both restricted to the media assigned to them, all areas on the 19th Floor (Ballroom floor, Foyer, Fountain Court) are open to the press.

In addition, a press room equipped with 11 phones, typewriters, and a cash bar will be open beginning at 5:30 PM Tuesday. This room is open to all credentialed press.

CREDENTIALS

The McGovern campaign will issue press credentials for election night, different from those given in the past few weeks for coverage. It is advisable to wear New York Police credentials in addition to the McGovern credentials.

Credentials can be applied for through the McGovern press office 212/593-8254 or at the West (press) Room on Election Night. All credentials will be distributed from 5:30 PM through the evening in the West Room on the 19th Floor at the Biltmore.
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The following credentials will be distributed and are necessary for admission to assigned areas:

**BLUE**: Print and radio tape media granted balcony space will be issued blue tags, which should be prominently displayed. Blue tags will also admit the bearer to the West Room.

**PINK**: Pink tags will be issued to photographers assigned to the stage front area. Only two such passes will be granted per news outlet. Additional photographers from a news outlet will not be admitted to this area, but will have access to the rest of the ballroom. Pink tags admit the bearer to the West Room. The balcony is closed to photographers per order of the Secret Service.

**BUFF**: Buff-colored tags will be distributed to those who do not desire or are not granted blue or pink tags. This group would include roving reporters, weekly papers, etc. They will admit the bearer to the West Room as well as to unrestricted 19th Floor areas.

Television or live radio personnel requesting buff tags (access to the West Room) will be issued them. No specific McGovern credentials will be necessary for use of the TV platforms or live radio facilities. New York Police credentials should be worn.

**ELECTION RETURNS**

Because the polls close as late as 10 PM on Tuesday, returns will come in very late. The McGovern campaign, however, has posted people in key districts around the state who will phone in results to the ballroom floor, where they will be posted or announced.

**INTERVIEWS WITH SENATOR MCGOVERN AND STAFF**

Since New Hampshire, Senator McGovern has chosen to watch election returns alone with his family, and thus has been unavailable for interviews prior to his appearance on the ballroom floor.

The Senator himself will appear on the ballroom floor when results are reasonably conclusive, perhaps about midnight.

The following key members of the staff, however, will be available for press briefings and interviews throughout the evening:
- Prof. Richard Wade -- State Chairman
- Gary Hart -- National Campaign Director
- Edward Rogoff -- State Campaign Manager
- Frank Mankiewicz -- National Political Director
- Pierre Salinger -- National Political Coordinator
- Pat Cadell -- Cambridge Survey Research, campaign pollster

Arrangements for contacting these people can be made throughout the evening by contacting Julie Adler, Susan Denvir, Bill Gruver or Dave Sugerman in the assigned press areas or the West Room.

**STILL PHOTO SESSION**

In order to meet newspaper deadlines, Senator McGovern will be available once during the evening for a still photo session in his room, as he and his family watch the returns. Only photographers with pink tags will be permitted to this photo session. Because the Senator's New Orleans schedule for Tuesday afternoon is still uncertain, the time of the photo session will be announced later. It should occur at approximately 9 PM.

**POST-ELECTION ANALYSIS**

The leaders of Senator McGovern's New York and national campaigns (mentioned above) will hold a press conference on Wednesday morning at the Hotel Biltmore to analyze the results of the New York primary and assess its impact on the convention. Details on time and room to come.

---

For more information of Election Night Credentials, call 212/987-3244.
McGovern Election Night - Biltmore, 19th Floor
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(Press Room)
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11 phones
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4 phones
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GRAND BALLROOM
58' x 114'

REEL CAMERAS (elevated)

LINE TV
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(10 phones - 10 more available)

PRINT PRESS
(12 phones - 6 more available)

PHOTOGRAPHERS (pink tag)

STAGE

Vandehill Ave.
"SOME PEOPLE HAVE BEEN EXPRESSING DOUBTS ABOUT WHETHER THE ADMINISTRATION HAS AN OVERALL GAME PLAN. IT HAS ONE. THE MAIN FEATURE IS TO KICK THE AMERICAN WORKER OFF THE TEAM."

PENSION: MCGOVERN believes that a pension is a worker's right -- and should move with him -- from job to job, city to city, industry to industry -- anywhere in the U.S. Millions of workers wake up one day to find that after 20 or 30 years of work their pensions have disappeared. MCGOVERN wants pensions to be protected like money in the bank -- by federal insurance.

MCGOVERN supports Senator Javits' legislation to safeguard pensions.

RUNAWAY SHOPS: Nixon's favoritism towards big business -- in the forms of investment tax credit, tax incentives and overseas credit -- has encouraged many New York companies to move to where they can exploit cheaper labor.

MCGOVERN believes that runaway shops owe their workers adequate compensation, retraining, and, of course, continued pension rights.

WORK SAFETY: Industrial accidents kill or disable 100,000 people every year. Congress passed the Occupational Safety and Health Act in 1970. But the Nixon Administration has refused to use the appropriated funds and employed only a handful of federal inspectors to enforce the Act.

MCGOVERN proposes:

-- to appoint 12,000 plant and health inspectors, with full worker access to their reports;

-- to pen up the standards for accident compensation;

-- to establish special compensation boards;

-- to train workers to act as their own inspectors.

UNEMPLOYMENT: MCGOVERN wants to provide family benefits, especially when workers are being retrained for a peacetime economy. His conversion plan calls for compensation up to 80% of salary for those laid off, and he would support legislation to extend unemployment compensation to a worker's dependents.

MCGOVERN believes that striking workers are also entitled to benefits, and would oppose any legislative attempts to cut off unemployment benefits to strikers.

WAGE CONTROLS AND NIXONMICS: The wage and price program is stacked to penalize the working people and swell the excess profits of the big corporations. In the first quarter of 1972, corporate profits reached an all time high.

MCGOVERN was the first national leader to denounce Nixon's pay board and to jump in on the side of the Labor leaders who walked off.

The Nixon Administration tried to control inflation by encouraging unemployment. Now we have lots of both and the working man loses.

The Administration opposes tax reform this year. MCGOVERN proposes measures that would shift the tax burden from the working man onto the wealthy and seal up corporation loopholes.

Victor Reuther, (UAW) understood the problem: "IF GEORGE MCGOVERN'S ECONOMIC RECONVERSION PLAN HAD BEEN ADOPTED WHEN IT WAS FIRST PROPOSED IN 1963, MANY OF THE MILLIONS NOW OUT OF WORK WOULD HAVE JOBS TODAY."

McGovern for President
605 Fifth Ave. N.Y.C., N.Y. 10017 212 832-1664
McGOVERN FOR SAFETY ON THE JOB

OVER 25 MILLION WORKING PEOPLE ARE INJURED ON THE JOB EACH YEAR
15,000 OF THESE PEOPLE LOSE THEIR LIVES

Yet, Richard Nixon is still failing to enforce the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 because:

NIXON DOES NOT WANT TO STEP ON THE TOES OF BIG BUSINESS

Senator McGOVERN has called for immediate federal action because he believes that YOU, AS A WORKING PERSON, SHOULD NOT BE ANOTHER VICTIM OF THE NIXON ADMINISTRATIONS APATHY

McGOVERN PLEDGES IN ADDITION

* Appointment of 12,000 new federal inspectors and industrial hygienists
* Worker access to safety inspectors' reports
* Extra training so workers can be their own inspectors
* An "Occupational Safety Administration" to set safety standards on new substances
* Urgent research on ways of improving working conditions
* Compensation boards and courts to award damages besides wage loss and medical bills
* Improved and uniform standards on Workmens Compensation
* Additional federal health teams in target areas

McGOVERN KNOWS THAT THE WORKING PERSON'S MOST PRICELESS POSSESSION IS HIS HEALTH

McGOVERN WILL WORK TO HELP HIM KEEP IT

It's not easy to get the reforms this country needs. On Primary Day in New York State -- June 20th -- you can't vote directly for George McGovern -- the names of Presidential Candidates do not appear on the ballot. But you can vote for the slate of McGovern delegates from your Congressional District.

VOTE THE McGOVERN SLATE

McGovern for President
605 Fifth Ave. N.Y.C., N.Y. 10017 212 832-1664
McGovern Delegates & Alternates

On Primary Day, June 20, Senator George McGovern's name will not appear on the ballot. You must vote for the delegates who are officially committed to McGovern. They will vote for him at the Democratic National Convention in July.

Following are the names of all the Delegates (D) and Alternates (A) in Each Congressional District who have pledged their support to George McGovern.

Take this list with you when you go to vote on June 20. Vote for each and every McGovern Delegate and Alternate in your Congressional District.

For further information, contact McGovern for President Headquarters, 605 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017, telephone 832-1664. For general voting information, contact the League of Women Voters, 675-5050 or the Board of Elections, 226-2600.

1--Suffolk
Richard M. Cummings/D
Nancy J. Mittman/D
Ann T. Hamilton/D
Andrew Malone, Jr./D
Gail E. McFarland/D
Chelsea A. Taylor/A
Barry M. McCovy/A
Duvid Chelsea contac-t-

2--Suffolk
Thomas J. Downey/D
Carlos J. Marchand/D
Margaret D. Renshaw/D
Lois A. Swanson/D
Ely A. Tarplin/D
Richard J. Him/A
Sue T. Olm/A

3--Suffolk/Nassau
Melvin C. Brenner/D
Ruth J. Brown/D
Patrick W. O'Keferty/D
Ira Nydick/A
Harriett F. Spitzer/D
Selmajean Zurer/A
Hilda A. Robbins/A
Stuart S. goldblatt/A

4--Nassau
David B. Roosevelt/D
Betty G. Schleif/D
Ethyl Berson/D
Bernard M. Rodin/D
Joan B. Lang/D
Charles E. Pissella/A
Linda M. Feldman/A
Bradley Angel/A

*David L. Ziehlenger/C
5--Nassau
Eleanor Chandler/D
Sols Handwerker/C
Barbara F. Kaplan/D
Abner Levine/D
Don M. Mankiewicz/D
Natalie Murfard/A
Kenneth Sunshine/D
Frances Boehm/A
Robert W. Garrett/A
Robert J. Rohan/A

6--Nassau/Queens
James E. Breslin/D
May W. Newburger/D
John F. X. O'Malley/D
HeLEN Getler/D
Gladys R. Schreiber/D
A I Alan Kaplan/A
Donald Shaffer/A
Roslyn Klaif/A

7--Queens
Arthur J. Katzman/D
Judith H. Tuller/D
Norman Hornowitz/D
Florence Ellerbee/D
Steven Lazarus/D
Rosemarie Russo/D
Robert J. Lennon/D
Marie Carmeghia/A
Preston Boyd, Jr./A
Mark Bodden/A

8--Queens
Edward L. Sadowsky/D
Sandra Povman/D
Clement Weinstein/D
Shirley Margolin/D
Phyllis B. Waxelbaum/D
Harry Nussdorf/D
Mellie M. Marshall/D
John A. Doyle/D
Elliot M. Abramson/A
Laura J. Mintzles/J
John Booker/A

9--Queens
Matthew J. Troy, Jr./D
Margaret Devlin/D
Ronald Detres/D
Eugene Nickerson/D
Daniel Gilmartin/D
Carole M. Smargon/D
Judith Birrell/A
Leonard Kahn/A

10--Bronx/Queens
Guido P. Menta/D
Dolores R. Magnotta/D
Andrew R. Tulloch/D
Diana Chapin/D
Margaret M. Tulley/D
William J. Arnone/D
Nicholas J. Miglione/A
Louise Landon/A

11--Bronx
Jean Larkin/Queens
Murray Levin/D
Annette Angelowitz/D
Mark E. Moskovitz/D
Jacqueline A. Trancynger/A
Joseph S. Gabriel/B
Seymour L. Wittek/A
John T. O'Connell/A
Patricia Buttacavoli/A

12--Brooklyn
Melvin Dubin/D
Rita Barash/D
Kenneth E. Elstein/D
Evelyn Levitt/D
Eugene Krauss/D
Ruth Williams/D
William Colton/D
Mary J. Fitzpatrick/A
Elizabeth Neal/A
Ben Drucker/A
Lewis Sterler/A

13--Brooklyn
Petra C. Killenbrey/D
Carol Zorbe Hurford/D
Richard J. Neubaus/D
Cynthia Edwards/D
Jose Sanchez/D
John T. Pratt/A
Renee Vera Cafiero/A

14--Brooklyn
Daniel S Collins/D
Helen Polonsky/D
Matthew J. D'Emic/D
Mary A. Slusarev/D
Maida M. Asofsuky/D
Joseph Garcia/A
Arlene S. Glassman/A

15--Brooklyn
Peggy Cass/D
Alexander Padow/D
Bernice Sealy/D
Jacob Gold/D
Rhoda Jacobs/D
Michael J. Gerstein/D
May G. Shandolow/D
William R. Nye/D
Patricia Astro/A
Jules L. Spodek/A
Arlene Rettig/A
Charles Reichenthal/A

16--Brooklyn
John L. Soldini/D
Victor Gotbaum/D
Robert J. Egan/D
Lillian C. Arrindell/D
Edward Murphy/D
Rosa Graham/D
Constance F. Oliver/A
Mark B. Herman/A

17--Manhattan/S.J.
Mark S. Tourin/D
Victor Overal/D
Irma Badillo/D
Elliot L. Engel/A
Beatrice H. Gordon/A
William H. Bliensstock/A

18--Manhattan
Eleanor Clark French/D
Peter A. Berle/D
Carol Gretler/D
Miguel Velez/D
Martha R. Overall/D
Kenneth A. Mills/D
Jaquline A. Berkowitz/D
Alvin Schlesinger/A
Robert F. Wagner Jr./A
Dallie F. Covello/A
Alfred Golds/A

19--Manhattan
Bouilah E. Sanders/D
Reed M. Wolcott/D
Olga A. Mendez/D
Eugene L. Nardelli/D
Brian Murthaugh/D
Gloria Lawrence/D
John Edmonds/D
Michael B. Sharkey/A
Martin B. Mosbacher/A
Allen Hodge/A

20--Manhattan/Bronx
Helayne Baron/D
Theodore S. Weiss/D
Victoria E.フリー/D
Rudolph W. Garcia/D
Anne M. Montero/D
Jack Newfield/D
Julia Paz/D
Alex J. Rosenberg/D
Michael D. Barry/A
Benjamin F. Lorick/A
Joan R. Serrano/A

21--Bronx
Robert Abrams/D
Janet Berger/A
Joseph A. Caskci/A
I D Robbins/D
Mark S. Tourin/D
Robin W. Weiner/D
Irma Badillo/D
Eliot L. Engel/A
Beatrice H. Gordon/A
William H. Bliensstock/A

22--Bronx
Edward A. Constance/D
Anne M. Robinson/D
Thomas J. Abinati/D
Harriet S. Davis/D
Ernest O. Oliendo/A
David A. Carr/A
Fred Douglas Fenwood/A
Susan S. Gluckman/A

23--Westchester/Bronx
Constance Hogarth/D
Edward C. Kornbluh/D
Joanne M. Robinson/D
Thomas J. Abinati/D
Harriet S. Davis/D
Ernest O. Oliendo/A
David A. Carr/A
Fred Douglas Fenwood/A
Susan S. Gluckman/A