

A RECORD OF
PRESS CONFERENCE
STATEMENTS

MADE BY

Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

AND

Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK

FOR

THE JOINT SENATE-HOUSE
REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP



PRESENTED BY MR. DIRKSEN

OCTOBER 5, 1962.—Ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1962

THE JOINT SENATE-HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP

FOR THE SENATE

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, *Leader*

THOMAS H. KUCHEL, *Whip*

BORRKE B. HICKENLOOPER, *Chairman of
the Policy Committee*

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, *Chairman of
the Conference*

FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

CHARLES A. HALLECK, *Leader*

LESLIE C. ARENDS, *Whip*

JOHN W. BYRNES, *Chairman of the Policy
Committee*

CHARLES B. HOEVEN, *Chairman of the
Conference*

CLARENCE J. BROWN, *Ranking Member,
Rules Committee*

PREMIER OFFICER

WILLIAM B. MILLER, *the Republican National Chairman*



FOREWORD

The pages which follow are a record of formal statements released to news media during the 2d session of the 87th Congress by the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership.

Together with similar statements issued during the first session (S. Doc. 63), they are unique because they mark the first time in congressional history that Senate and House leaders of a political party have met regularly in joint conferences to determine policy and to formulate policy statements during the Congress.

Initiated by President Eisenhower shortly before his tenure in the White House ended January 20, 1961, the Joint Leadership has performed a function that has been both constructive and unifying. The procedure has been simple:

The Senate and House leaders in their meetings have discussed not only legislative problems, but domestic and international affairs with which the Congress is concerned. Frequently the views of other party leaders and top experts have been sought, as well as those of ranking Republican Members of Congress.

The members of the Joint Leadership are, for the Senate: Everett McKinley Dirksen, Republican leader; Thomas H. Kuchel, whip; Bourke B. Hickenlooper, chairman of the policy committee; Leverett Saltonstall, chairman of the conference. For the House: Charles A. Halleck, Republican leader; Leslie C. Arends, whip; John W. Byrnes, chairman of the policy committee; Charles B. Hoeven, chairman of the conference; Clarence J. Brown, ranking Republican member of the Rules Committee. The meetings have been presided over by the Republican national chairman, Representative William E. Miller.

When policy statements have been approved the usual procedure has been for Senator Dirksen and Representative Halleck, acting for the Joint Leadership, to hold a press conference, read the statements to the news correspondents, and submit to questions. When they have thought it appropriate, the members of the Joint Leadership have varied this procedure by all appending their names to a statement and releasing it to the press in that manner.

In all cases, copies of the statements have been distributed to all Republican Members of the Senate and House within a few hours after their adoption.

The statements that follow have been grouped under subject heading to provide continuity in their examination.

CONTENTS

	Page
Civil Rights.....	47-50
Cuba.....	7-8
Economy, The.....	29-35
Eighty-seventh Congress, The.....	1-4
Estes Scandal.....	44-45
Feed Grain Program.....	46
Foreign Affairs, Conduct of.....	8-16
Investigation of Press.....	46-47
Liberal Papers, The.....	16-19
Medical Assistance for Aged.....	42-44
Nuclear Test Ban.....	19-28
Presidential Promises.....	4-7
Spending.....	37-42
Steel Price Controversy.....	35-37
Tax Cut.....	42-43

A RECORD OF PRESS CONFERENCE STATEMENTS

THE 87TH CONGRESS

October 13, 1968

By the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership

Never in the history of the Nation has the legislative branch of the Federal Government spent so much time accomplishing so little as it did in the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

On one count alone—its failure to pass any of 12 major appropriations bills by June 30, the end of the fiscal year—this session sets a modern record for inaction, probably an alltime one. By July 30, none of the 12 appropriations bills had yet been passed. By August 30, only four had been passed. By September 30, only one more had been enacted. The last of the 12 was not passed until October 13, an unprecedented collapse of the appropriations process.

(To supply a comparison, the famed Republican 80th Congress, which President Truman mislabeled a "do nothing" Congress, had passed all its appropriations bills by June 30, 1948.)

However, the failure to pass appropriations bills was only a glaring symptom of the mismanagement and inefficiency which characterized the handling of the Kennedy administration's legislative program. Yet the fault was by no means solely that of the Congress. A major share of the blame must go to the executive branch itself. Consider the facts:

The White House and every single agency of the executive branch was under the management of Democrats.

The Senate was composed of 64 Democrats and only 36 Republicans.

The House of Representatives was composed of 263 Democrats and only 174 Republicans.

Every congressional committee, every chairmanship, and even a stacked House Rules Committee was completely in Democratic hands.

President Kennedy, as a candidate in 1960, had told the Nation, that if he were given a Democratic Congress he could pledge forward progress. He got what he sought, but the Nation is still waiting for progress.

Why haven't the promised results come to pass?

The primary function of the Congress is to enact the laws.

The primary function of the executive branch is to administer the laws.

Under the Constitution, the President is directed to "give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient * * *."

But the Constitution clearly envisioned, in fact it in some instances specified, that the origin, preparation, and passage of laws be vested in the Congress.

The Kennedy administration undertook the complete management of the 87th Congress. It originated the legislative proposals. It drafted the bills. It dispatched them to the Congress. It had them introduced. It demanded their passage.

The numbers were staggering and without precedent. More than 550 legislative requests poured, like water from a spigot, out of the White House. Each had an indiscriminate "urgent" tag on it. The legislative pipelines were glutted with New Frontier proposals for which there was often no need, frequently no public demand, and in many cases open opposition by the people.

No Member of Congress had ever witnessed anything like it. The White House requests, for the most part, never appeared to have more than two objectives—spending more money, or concentrating more power in the Federal Government, or both. If there was any basic, substantive philosophy of government beyond these two objectives, any hewing of new paths to meet the impact of the onrushing scientific age, it was not evident.

Flying squadrons of White House and departmental "liaison" men crisscrossed the Halls of Congress attempting to reduce the chaos to at least recognizable disorder.

The inevitable happened.

Scores of legislative proposals were quietly forgotten. Face-saving and, in some cases, face-losing compromises were offered to get bills, bearing little more than their original titles, passed and down to the White House. In some cases where a clear-cut showdown was sought, the legislation went down to galling defeat.

Forgotten were proposals for major civil rights legislation, Youth Conservation Corps, aid to education, a fallout shelter program, a wilderness system, lending charges disclosure, mass transit plans, standby tax authority and standby public works, among others.

Compromised were the farm plan, the tax bill, the U.N. bond issue, the postal rate increase, and a public works bill.

Defeated decisively were proposals for an Urban Affairs Department, compulsory hospital insurance, and the original "regimentation or ruin" farm bill.

Abandoned after it was on the Senate floor: a curb on literacy tests for voters.

Passed, with active Republican roles in redrafting the legislation: Welfare and Pension Disclosure Act, the manpower retraining program, and drug safety control.

We believe we performed a constructive service in first proposing a congressional resolution on Cuba to demonstrate that America is united in an unyielding demand that the infamous Castro regime will not be permitted to become a nuclear launching pad or a base for exportation of Communist imperialism.

What, then, did this Kennedy-managed Congress accomplish?

Laws were enacted to increase the channels on TV sets, to promote educational TV, to increase the national debt, to increase the size of the Peace Corps, to outlaw poll taxes, to continue certain corporate and excise taxes, and to call up 150,000 Ready Reserves, if needed.

In addition, unanimous Republican support enabled the President to obtain passage of his communications satellite bill over the violent filibustering by Senate liberal Democrats. Not a single Republican participated in this 19-day display of obstruction and filibustering.

Unquestionably, the major enactment of the session came with the bipartisan support accorded the trade bill. The bill passed the Senate 78 to 8; the House 298 to 125. It gives the President broad authority to make tariff reductions in return for comparable benefits and is aimed at opening the European Common Market to American products. However, the country must understand that success or failure of the trade program rests upon wise and careful administration. Wrongly administered, it will be ruinous in its impact on the economy of the United States.

In sum, the list of enactments is for the most part unimpressive and represents only a fraction of the time that the Congress spent dealing with a deluge of paper and words dispatched to it by the White House.

Beyond question, quantity, not quality, patchwork, not design, disorganization, not leadership, are the phrases which best describe the second Kennedy legislative year.

It was a "do little" year at a time when the exigencies of our age demanded far more. In the world today this Nation has not that much time to waste.

January 18, 1962

By Representative Halleck

Nothing in the history of our country has aged faster than the so-called "New Frontier." With President Kennedy's state of the Union message it has grown overnight into no frontier at all.

It is the old story of more power for the White House, more spending, more debt and more taxes.

The Congress is now asked to give the President power to order big spending projects at his own discretion without regard to cost.

The Congress is asked to give the President the power to "eliminate" tariffs as he sees fit.

The Congress is asked to give the President power to lower—but, significantly, not to raise—taxes at any time he chooses. This could mean just before an election, if it suits his purpose, and I say this with respect to any Chief Executive who might have such authority.

Through the years, Republicans have supported public works projects where study in the Congress has proved them to be in the Nation's interest.

We have supported the expansion of foreign trade, with the only reservation that American workingmen, farmers, and industrial producers be protected from ruinous competition from abroad. And by our record in the Republican 80th and 83d Congresses, we have demonstrated our determination that the tax burden of all citizens be lowered whenever possible.

I do not know what action this Congress will take on the proposals put forward by President Kennedy in his message. But I hope the country understands that this Congress is controlled by the President's party—the Democrat Party—by a margin of 2 to 1 in the Senate and 3 to 2 in the House of Representatives.

If there is such a lack of confidence in this Democrat Congress that its power must be transferred to the President, then all the more reason to elect a Republican Congress.

July 10, 1962

By Senator Dirksen

Congress convened 6 months ago today. It is doubtful if any session of Congress in the history of the Republic ever spent so much time accomplishing so little.

Not a single appropriations bill has been passed although 12 of them should have been enacted by July 1, the beginning of the new fiscal year.

According to the congressional calendars, only two legislative bills have been enacted that are entitled to the calendar designation of "major legislation."

The easy place to put the blame would be on the Congress, where the Democrats enjoy a 2 to 1 majority in the Senate and a 3 to 2 majority in the House. Maybe some of the blame belongs there, but we think most of the blame belongs on the Kennedy administration.

Since January, President Kennedy has sent 27 messages and 38 executive communications, totaling over 100,000 words, to the Congress. They might be said to typify the Kennedy administration—both in the 1960 presidential campaign and in its 18 months in office—the words have come in a deluge, the actions in a trickle.

The case for the failure of the Kennedy legislative program is a simple one: It is not popular with the American people and it is not popular with Congress.

The Kennedy deficit spending has not solved unemployment nor helped the economy. Under this administration unemployment rose. Investors have more than a \$100 billion stock market crash staring them in the face. These are two very substantial reasons why Congress has rejected or refused to act on most of the Kennedy legislative proposals which would further increase the cost of government, the size of the deficits, and executive power.

President Kennedy, despite overwhelming Democratic majorities in Congress, says he needs more Democrats elected to Congress. We would suggest that Members of Congress are elected not to represent the White House but the people. What the American people want is not more Democrats in Congress but some sane legislation passed that will restore confidence in the economy.

PRESIDENTIAL PROMISES

May 28, 1962

By Representative Halleck

President Kennedy has been in office nearly a year and a half now and we, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican leadership, think it is time to examine what he promised to do as a candidate and what he actually has done in office.

We can all remember that Mr. Kennedy was critical of unemployment, business failures, interest rates, and numerous other factors affecting the American economy. He said he would change all this while maintaining a "sound fiscal policy." He repeatedly promised—to quote his favorite phrase—to "get America moving again."

The average rate of unemployment under Eisenhower in 1960 was 5.6 percent. Under Kennedy it has averaged above 6 percent since he took office. Business failures increased 11 percent in 1961 under

Kennedy compared to 1960 under Eisenhower, while mortgage foreclosures were up 40 percent, the biggest 1-year increase since the depression year 1932.

As for interest rates, which Mr. Kennedy repeatedly promised to lower, not a single category of interest rates has been reduced, including the basic prime and discount rates.

In the field of fiscal affairs, despite his talk about sound policies and balanced budgets, Mr. Kennedy has had two successive deficits with a third in prospect and has already increased the cost of government to the highest point in peacetime history.

There are many other Kennedy promises on the economic front that have vanished into thin air. He was critical of the cost of living and said his administration would hold it down because it would "have to." In each of the last 3 months the cost of living has reached new highs and today under Mr. Kennedy it is the highest in the history of the United States.

Now, when you add incorrect predictions by Mr. Kennedy on the gross national product, together with a severely declining stock market, to all the other factors we have related, then you can only conclude that Mr. Kennedy promises better than he performs.

May 28, 1962

By Senator Dirksen

The bloom is off the Kennedy promises on many other fronts in addition to the economic sector and we are going to list some of them for the record.

Mr. Kennedy repeatedly said his farm program would cut the costs of the Republican program by as much as \$2 billion. Well, in its first year it cost \$1.1 billion more. He criticized the farm parity ratio under Eisenhower, but under Kennedy it has dropped to 79 percent, the lowest figure since 1939. He pledged he would raise price supports to 90 percent of parity and he has not raised a single one to anywhere near that figure.

On civil rights, he pledged that a major civil rights bill would "be among the first orders of business" when the Congress met in January 1961. It is now May 1962 and he has not even requested the legislation. Mr. Kennedy further promised he would issue "the long delayed Executive order putting an end to racial discrimination" in federally assisted housing and it is May 1962 and he hasn't issued it yet.

Mr. Kennedy repeatedly assailed President Eisenhower for no new reclamation starts, yet we had 49 new starts under Eisenhower. However, the record is that in 1961 Mr. Kennedy did not add a single new start to the Eisenhower program. He told the people of Montana he would seek "early" authorization of the Paradise-Knolls project, but it is now May 1962 and he hasn't even asked for it.

Mr. Kennedy pledged a "fresh and imaginative program" for the depressed timber industry and it hasn't been mentioned since.

Mr. Kennedy pledged the aircraft workers in California he would "wholeheartedly" support the B-70 program, but as soon as he took office, he asked Congress to kill it.

Mr. Kennedy told the voters he would do countless other things if they gave him a Democratic Congress. Well, they gave him whopping

majorities of 2 to 1 in the Senate and 3 to 2 in the House but in spite of this he hasn't delivered on his pledges.

We would remind Mr. Kennedy that Republicans didn't make those promises—he did. It certainly should be clear to the American people by now that too often what Mr. Kennedy says he will do and what he does are complete strangers to each other.

(The following background information was released with Senator Dirksen's and Congressman Halleck's May 28 statements:)

Item	Kennedy	Fact
Unemployment.....	"We have more than 4,000,000 unemployed—small businesses are falling at a record rate—and there is poverty on our farms * * * these failures must and will be reversed." (Raleigh, N.C., Sept. 17, 1960.)	The average monthly rate of unemployment during 1960 under Eisenhower was 5.8 percent; it has averaged 6.6 percent for Mr. Kennedy's first 16 months. (Labor Department.)
Business failures.....	(See above).....	261 total business failures had a monthly average of 1,425, 136 more per month than in 1960 under Eisenhower. (Commerce Department.)
Interest rates.....	"* * * I have proposed a program to create a new frontier of opportunity * * * by reversing the artificially high interest rate policies of this administration." (Oct. 5, 1960.)	No change in prime rate since Aug. 23, 1960; none in discount rate since Aug. 12, 1960. (Federal Reserve Board.)
Cost of living.....	"In the last few months, the cost of living has reached an all-time high * * * I believe we are going to have to do much better." (Roanoke, Va., Nov. 4, 1960.)	Living costs in April 1961 rose, setting a new record for the third straight month. (Labor Department.)
Fiscal budget.....	"* * * it is extremely important that the United States maintain to the extent possible, a sound fiscal policy * * ." (Seattle, Wash., Sept. 6, 1960.) "It is extremely important that the United States maintain, to the extent possible, a balanced budget. The only true reasons justifying an unbalanced budget would be a great national emergency, and serious unemployment." (Washington News, Oct. 3, 1960.)	For the fiscal year 1961, the deficit was \$3,800,000,000; for 1962 it is estimated at \$7,000,000,000; for 1963 the budget calls for \$91,500,000,000 in expenditures, highest peacetime budget in history. (Bureau of the Budget.)
Farm costs.....	"I have stated * * * that our agricultural program will cost a billion and a half, possibly \$1,000,000,000 less than the present agricultural program." (On TV debate, Oct. 23, 1960.)	In its very last year, 1960, the Kennedy program actually cost \$1,393,000,000 more than the Eisenhower program for any year. (Agriculture Department.)
Parity rates.....	Democratic platform: " * * * issue on basic commodities at not less than 90 percent of parity * * *" " * * * my promises are in the platform you have adopted." (J.F.K. acceptance speech, Los Angeles, July 15, 1960.)	The parity ratio fell to 79 percent for 1961 under Mr. Kennedy, the lowest full-year figure since 1938. (Agriculture Department.)
Civil rights.....	"Such civil rights legislation is being prepared * * * that bill will be among the first orders of business when a new Congress meets in January." (Los Angeles, Sept. 9, 1960.)	No Presidential communication to this effect.
Housing discrimination.....	" * * * the next President must be prepared to put an end to racial and religious discrimination in every field of Federal activity—by issuing the long delayed Executive order putting an end to racial discrimination in federally assisted housing." (Los Angeles, Sept. 9, 1960.)	"I think I have stated that I would issue that order when I considered it to be in the public interest and when I considered it to make important contributions to salvaging the rights of our citizens." (J.F.K. press conference, Jan. 15, 1961, as reported in New York Times of Jan. 15, 1961.)
No new starts.....	" * * * I propose a 9-point program for resource development to be initiated promptly in January of 1961. First we will reverse the policy of no new starts." (Billings, Mont., Sept. 21, 1960.)	During the year 1961 there was not a single new reclamation start added to the Eisenhower program. (Interior Department.)

Item	Kennedy	Fact
Paradise-Knoelis.....	"* * * the next President of the United States must support early authorization of the multipurpose project in the Paradise-Knoelis area." (Billings, Mont., Sept. 22, 1962.)	No Presidential communication to this effect.
Depressed timber industry.	"It is time for a bold and imaginative program to resolve the problems of our Nation's timber industry * * * and in 1962 we are going to put it into action." (Spokane, Oreg., Sept. 7, 1962.)	Do.
B-70.....	"I endorse wholeheartedly the B-70 manned aircraft." (San Diego, Calif., Nov. 2, 1960.)	Defense Secretary McNamara said the money Congress had appropriated for the B-70 was not necessary and that President Kennedy approved the decision. (New York Times, Oct. 28, 1961.)
Democratic majorities.	"I think that we can elect a Democratic President, a Democratic House, and a Democratic Senate, and I think when that is done, this country can begin to move again." (Portland, Oreg., Sept. 7, 1960.)	There are 64 Democrats to 36 Republicans in the Senate and 262 Democrats to 174 Republicans in the House.

CUBA

September 7, 1962

By Representative Halleck

On September 1 the Soviet Union announced what this Nation has long known—that Russia had agreed to supply "armaments" to Cuba and technical specialists "for training Cuban servicemen."

It is important to point out that the only thing new about Soviet military assistance to Cuba is the Kremlin's confirmation of it. Evidently forgotten is the fact that the Department of State on April 3, 1961—nearly 18 months ago—issued its White Paper on Cuba which contained the following facts:

As of 18 months ago, 30,000 tons of arms had been shipped by Iron Curtain countries to Cuba, having an estimated value of \$50 million;

Included as of 18 months ago were Soviet JS-2 51-ton tanks, Soviet SU-100 assault guns, Soviet T-34 35-ton tanks, and Soviet field guns of 76mm., 85mm., and 122mm. caliber;

Also included as of 18 months ago were an unspecified number of Soviet and Communist Czechoslovakian military technicians sent to train a Cuban military establishment estimated at between 250,000 and 400,000 personnel, the largest in this hemisphere except for our own military establishment.

This week, President Kennedy advised the American people these armaments have been increased since July by the Soviet Union through shipments of antiaircraft missiles with a slant range of 25 miles, torpedo boats with guided missile launchers having a range of 15 miles, and 3,500 military technicians.

On the basis of official information from the State Department 18 months ago and the President's statement only 3 days ago, it must be inescapably concluded that not only is the situation in Cuba serious but that it is getting worse from the point of view of our own vital interests and the security of this country.

Obviously there is no easy solution, but we believe it imperative for the Congress, the executive branch and the American people to unite in a calm, considered approach to meet this problem. The time is at hand for effective and decisive leadership in the Cuban situation. Our national security must be our first concern.

September 7, 1962

By Senator Dirksen

From 1823 until 1947 the nations of North and South America were protected by the Monroe Doctrine which declared that the United States would consider the extension of any alien system of government "to any portions of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

In 1947 this doctrine was extended to embrace action by all American nations when the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance was signed at Rio de Janeiro. In 1954 under the Caracas Declaration this multilateral promise of action was specifically applied to communism.

The United States and its sister members of the Organization of American States are now confronted by the existence of a Communist government in Cuba and delivery of Soviet arms and Soviet military technicians to that Communist state by the admission of the Soviet Union itself. These facts constitute a deliberate challenge to the Monroe Doctrine of 1823, the Rio de Janeiro Treaty of 1947, and the Caracas Declaration of 1954.

Several courses of action have already been advanced. In view of our treaty commitments, however, we believe:

(1) a course of action should be promptly fixed by the Organization of American States in concert, or

(2) as President Kennedy has already stated in his speech to U.S. editors (Apr. 20, 1961), "if the nations of this hemisphere should fail to meet their commitments against outside Communist penetration" then the United States must act on its own.

Obviously the Congress of the United States has responsibility in the matter. In 1955 when Communist China menaced Formosa and the Pescadores the Congress by joint resolution authorized the President of the United States to employ our own Armed Forces as he deemed necessary to protect those Asiatic islands.

We, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, believe that the Congress should now adopt a similar authorizing resolution to meet the Cuban problem and we shall invite our Democratic counterparts to join us in its drafting, its introduction, and its passage by this Congress before it adjourns. We recommend that the measure be drawn up by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House acting in consultation with the appropriate agencies of the executive branch.

This course of action by the Congress will reflect the determination and clear purpose of the American people and will demonstrate to the world the firmness of this Nation in meeting this problem.

CONDUCT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

January 18, 1962

By the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership

We think our attitude on the conduct of foreign relations by President Kennedy has been clearly demonstrated over the past year.

We have always subscribed to the bipartisan approach on matters beyond the water's edge, but as the late Senator Vandenberg once

said we have too often been in on crash landings without participating in the takeoffs.

This was true last year in the case of Cuba. We know that many people thought we should have turned the Cuban fiasco into political capital at the time of the disaster. We thought—and we still think to have done so with a new President in office would only have increased the enormous damage to American prestige which was caused by that incident.

As indicated by our statements we have never been satisfied with the handling of the Laotian situation; likewise, we have been deeply concerned over Vietnam. We have not been altogether receptive to the administration's reactions to the Berlin crisis precipitated as a result of the President's Vienna meeting with Khrushchev, but we did not regard our differences as sufficient to do other than to support the President in the Berlin crisis.

Now the question comes: How about the year 1962?

The administration has 1 year of seasoning under its belt. We fully intend to pursue a bipartisan course wherever possible, but it should be made unmistakably clear that when we have sufficient grounds to differ with the President in the best interest of the country, we intend to speak up without hesitation.

March 1, 1962

By Senator Dirksen

Nearly a year ago the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership began raising questions as to whether the United States would gain more or lose more by following President Kennedy's policy of opposing friendly nations in Europe to win support in Africa and Asia.

For example, the Joint Leadership twice asked President Kennedy to clarify a policy that included casting U.S. votes in the United Nations with the Soviet Union against our ally, Portugal, on the Angola question. There was no response from the administration.

One by one we have been offending our NATO allies under this highly questionable diplomatic conduct.

For example, we raised Dutch ire by revoking landing rights for planes carrying troop replacements to Netherlands New Guinea. We have affronted the French by taking a "hands off" attitude in the case of the French diplomats being tried on espionage charges in Cairo. The British and Belgians, in fact a good deal of Europe, have entertained serious doubts about American policy in the Congo province of Katanga.

Two weeks ago, the New York Times evaluated our relations with our NATO allies as being at the lowest point since NATO was created in 1949.

A week ago, our NATO allies themselves provided a more accurate measurement of our loss of prestige when they gave a cool reception to our request to cut their trade with Cuba. So far the response has been negative, with our allies reminding us of our recent behavior when they called on us for help.

Nobody questions the need of this country to maintain and improve relations with the African and Asiatic nations so recently freed from colonialism. But we must seriously question a course of conduct that is impairing our relations with our NATO allies.

We suggest that President Kennedy could properly review this problem before American prestige in Europe suffers even greater damage.

March 8, 1962

By Representative Halleck

It is becoming clear that the Congress now faces a decision on the conditions of financial assistance to nations that seize American property without justification or just compensation.

The most recent example of expropriation is, of course, the seizure of International Telephone & Telegraph property (Companhia Telefonica Nacional) in the Brazilian State of Rio Grande do Sul. The settlement proposed by Governor Brizola is \$400,000 for a \$7 million American holding. The fact that this action was taken by a state does not relieve the National Government of Brazil of its responsibility.

Brazil in the last 4 months has received \$90 million in U.S. loans and its President Goulart is coming to the United States on April 3 to consult with President Kennedy about \$600 million more in assistance.

Expropriation is not unknown in Latin America—in fact, Swift & Co. and the American & Foreign Co. both have lost plants in Brazil in recent years.

Government expropriation of private property under certain conditions has long been recognized as a sovereign prerogative provided just compensation is paid. But certainly our American taxpayers and investors should be assured that nations receiving foreign assistance from the United States will not be allowed to get away with capricious seizures of American property and on their own terms.

Within a few weeks the Congress will consider the proposed \$3 billion Alliance for Progress legislation for Latin America. We believe that this proposal, and any other like it for other parts of the world, should carry a provision that any nation seeking benefits from this program offer advance commitments against such seizures of American property abroad.

Certainly the attitude of any nation on expropriation should be a major factor in our consideration of a loan request and if, after the loan is made, unjustified seizures do occur, there should be a provision for congressional review of any assistance going to the offending nation. We will support such protective provisions, as will, in our opinion, a majority of the Members of Congress.

June 29, 1962

By Senator Dirksen

In June 1960, President Kennedy, then a Senator, said:

Our task is to devise a national strategy—based not on 11th hour responses to Soviet-created crises—but a comprehensive set of carefully prepared, long-term policies designed to increase the strength of the non-Communist world.

Mr. Kennedy has been President for 18 months and no new national strategy has been set forth. For some time however, there have been recurring stories in the press that a new foreign policy posture is in

the drafting stage under the direction of Walt W. Rostow, Chairman of the State Department's Policy Planning Board, and is now ready for presentation to the President.

Earlier this week, Mr. Rostow appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and I asked him if the new policy draft was based, as reported in one press account, on the belief that the Soviet Union is "mellowing." After conferring with two other State Department officials present with him, he declined to answer on the grounds of executive privilege although he freely answered another question of mine concerning the policy draft.

No Member of Congress has any certain knowledge of what the draft contains, but, as members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership we want to make several observations:

1. We believe any shift in policy predicated on the idea the Soviet Union has deviated from its goal of world Communist domination would be an enormous error that could only lead to disaster for the free world.

2. We urge, in the strongest terms, that no new policy course be undertaken without the fullest consultation by the executive branch with the appropriate leaders of Congress in both political parties.

3. We question that President Kennedy would countenance any change in policy which viewed the Communist conspiracy in less than the most realistic terms and trust that prior consultation with congressional leaders will be assured in the interest of our traditional bipartisan concept of foreign policy.

June 29, 1962

By Representative Halleck

Anyone would be blind indeed who believed the policies of our Government should never be changed, never be adapted to new developments, or never be improved where improvement was possible. Certainly all Americans want the best foreign policy we can have, particularly when it applies to the world Communist conspiracy.

Starting in the Truman administration and by the end of the Eisenhower administration, the United States had concluded 42 multilateral and bilateral defense agreements with nations completely ringing the Communist world. These and countless other actions embracing a tough policy line—including Korea, Iran, Lebanon, Formosa and other areas—were designed to thwart Communist aggression and to demonstrate America's determination to win the cold war.

Only 2 days ago, President Kennedy, in his press conference, declared he is today applying "President Eisenhower's policy" of 7 years ago on Formosa to the current Red Chinese buildup near the islands of Quemoy and Matsu.

Concerning the cold war, high officials of the Kennedy administration have claimed repeatedly that we are winning. U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson in January said "the promised victory of communism keeps receding into the future" and has been doing so since 1945. Chester Bowles declared that in the last 10 years "the Soviet political and economic offensive" has failed and he added "I submit the Soviets have not been winning the cold war; they have been losing it."

We Republicans ask a simple question: If we have been winning, why change a winning policy? If, as we doubt, the Soviets are

mellowing, why change a policy that brought it about? It doesn't make sense. Improvements? Certainly. Basic change? No. Let's keep the policy tough. We must maintain a course of action that is determined and firm.

July 31, 1962

By Senator Dirksen

It has been the repeatedly stated position of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership to support the national administration on matters of foreign policy whenever or wherever we believed the cause of the American people and free peoples everywhere was being served.

However, events following the initial bold assertions of the administration on Laos 18 months ago have given us strong reservations and we have stated some of them publicly. With the signing of the Geneva accord on Laos last week, we believe additional questions need to be raised.

On fundamentals, it appears we have repeated in the Laotian problem four basic errors of the past.

In giving Communist Poland a veto in the International Control Commission, set up to administer the provisions of the accord, have we not repeated the Roosevelt administration's error of promising the Soviet Union at Yalta a veto in the United Nations Security Council?

In forcing the Laotian to accept a coalition government recognizing Communists, have we not repeated the Truman administration's error of trying to force Chiang Kai-shek to accept a coalition government and a truce which led to the fall of China to the Communists?

In cutting off aid to the Laotian Government to compel acceptance of a coalition, have we not repeated the Truman administration's error of announcing termination of aid to Chiang Kai-shek unless he agreed to a truce with the Chinese Reds?

In disengaging ourselves in Laos, are we not repeating the Truman administration's Korean error by giving the North Vietnam Communist troops in Laos a "privileged sanctuary" from which they can gain a corridor to our own forces in South Vietnam?

There has never been a simple solution in Laos. Like all Americans, we wish fervently for the success of the Laotian accord, but wishful thinking has seldom produced results in dealing with the Communists in the past.

August 30, 1962

By Senator Dirksen

Eight months ago, the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, in its first meeting of 1962, issued a statement signed by all members expressing their intention to support the Kennedy administration on foreign policy but reserving the right and responsibility to disagree if sufficient reason existed.

We think it is time to take stock.

In the past 18 months in the Far East, the United States has taken a stand in Vietnam, but in contradictory fashion we have promoted the establishment of a highly suspect coalition government in Laos, participated in the delivery of west New Guinea into the hands of

Indonesia without a vote of the people, and stood passively by while India by force of arms seized Goa, a Portuguese possession.

In Africa, the administration has actively supported armed intervention by the United Nations in the internal affairs of the Congo in contradiction of the spirit of the U.N. Charter, and we twice voted against our ally, Portugal, and with the Soviet Union on the so-called Angola resolution in the U.N.

In Europe, our Berlin stand, while generally commendable, has been accompanied by a military emphasis on conventional forces which has created serious distrust on the part of our allies, West Germany and France, that we would employ nuclear weapons if needed.

In this hemisphere, the Cuban fiasco, the Peruvian diplomatic blunder, and the foundering of the Alliance for Progress have done much to impair our efforts in Latin and South America.

By any reasonable standard, the record of the Kennedy administration in foreign affairs has shown lack of understanding, the absence of any overall policy, and a tendency toward concession rather than standing on principle.

There is considerable evidence that many of the administration's foreign policy advisers believe the Soviet Union is "maturing" and that a policy of concession will hasten the process. This is a miscalculation that should be rapidly remedied. One need only look at the Berlin wall, the Soviet shipments to Cuba, and Communist activity in Vietnam to know the cold war is just as intense and menacing today as it has been anytime since it began 17 years ago.

August 31, 1962

By the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership

Text of a letter sent to the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, by the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership and signed by each of its members:

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The cornerstone of American propaganda has always been the truth. For many months we have had a great truth staring our Government in the face and little or nothing has been done to take advantage of it.

We refer to the East Berlin wall—the "Wall of Shame."

Most Americans know that the Communists built the wall to stop the flight of more than 2,000 East Germans a day from the terror of communism, but how well does the world know it?

Most Americans know the Communists were forced to police the wall with machineguns to stop the flight of hundreds of more East Germans who were willing to risk their lives rather than submit to communism, but how well does the world know it?

In 1 year the Communists have machinegunned to death approximately 40 persons seeking freedom, including a 12-year-old boy and a dozen teenagers, one of whom was

allowed to bleed to death for 1 hour in full public view. These victims of barbarous Communist murder are martyrs, so far unsung, so far unheralded, save in West Berlin.

Their lives, offered up on the "Wall of Shame," spell out better than millions of words the great truth: Without walls, without barbed wire, without guns, and without terror the Communist regimes, wherever they be, cannot thwart man's flight to freedom.

As members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, we urge that the U.S. Government take the initiative in organizing worldwide peaceful demonstrations against the "Wall of Shame" and against these Communist murders.

We urge that every free government be invited to join in this effort, that every means of communication and propaganda be employed to the fullest extent.

We urge that all motion picture footage which exists, all photographs, all documentary evidence, all interviews with witnesses, in fact every iota of truth available, be amassed for worldwide distribution by television and radio, by shortwave, by film, by the printed word and picture.

Peaceful demonstrations, international letterwriting campaigns, picketing, and protest rallies by people of all ages, races, and faiths should be actively and openly promoted by free governments everywhere.

Certainly no more powerful message could be sent behind the Iron Curtain, certainly no stronger case for the cause of freedom could be impressed on the peoples of the neutral nations than the truth about the barbaric Communist performance at Berlin's "Wall of Shame."

We feel confident the course we suggest would strengthen us in any negotiations, current or future. We need only to use that most powerful of weapons, the truth—and this is on our side.

Mr. President, we feel deeply the time for action is now.

Respectfully yours,

THE JOINT SENATE-HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP:

(Signed:)

For the Senate:

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

For the House:

CHARLES A. HALLECK,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
CLARENCE J. BROWN.

On September 1, 1962, President Kennedy in a letter replied that:

* * * your specific suggestions are constructive, and I am asking that any which have not been acted upon be examined afresh. I am attaching a memorandum on steps

which have been taken this past year to insure worldwide understanding of the issues involved. I am sure you will agree it shows an energetic effort and a gratifying response.

If, after studying this memorandum, you have further suggestions to make, I would be glad to have them. It is important to peace and to the freedom of the brave people of West Berlin that it be understood in every capital that on this matter we as a Nation are united in our determination.

October 5, 1962

By Senator Dirksen

The American tradition calls for a bipartisan approach to foreign affairs. We Republicans wholly subscribe to this bipartisan tradition and have done our best at all times to maintain it. But tradition also calls for both political parties to place the facts before the American people prior to a national election, including the facts about our posture in the world.

We believe it fair to take the 1960 campaign for a point of reference. In that campaign, President Kennedy repeatedly pictured the United States as losing "prestige" and "pre-eminence" in the world, and he repeatedly cited Cuba as evidence that "our security and our leadership are both slipping away."

When Mr. Kennedy took office in January 1961, an invasion force of Cuban refugees had already been training for 9 months under the Eisenhower administration, and our military leaders believed the projected Cuban invasion would succeed. Everyone now knows the reason it didn't succeed, when undertaken in April 1961, was because President Kennedy withheld air support and publicly advised the people of Cuba that we would not help any civilian insurrection.

Our loss of prestige, as a result of the Cuban fiasco, has since become more acute because of repeated Soviet shipments of military weapons and military personnel to Cuba without intercession by the United States either under the Monroe Doctrine or through the Organization of American States.

Fact No. I: Cuba, 2 years ago susceptible to overthrow by a handful of Cuban refugees, today is a Soviet military base that could require tens of thousands of troops if liberty is to be restored on that Communist-dominated island.

In the broader view of the American position in world affairs, the picture is little better than in Cuba.

We have antagonized our NATO ally, Portugal, by our U.N. votes on Angola, a Portuguese possession, and our indifferent stand on Goa when India by armed attack seized that Portuguese holding.

We have severely strained the bonds of friendship with another NATO ally, the Netherlands, by siding with Indonesia in its takeover of Dutch New Guinea, an area with which the Indonesians have no ethnic or geographic ties whatsoever.

Differences with France and West Germany over our handling of the West Berlin situation, and the fears of Thailand and other southeast Asian nations concerning our treatment of the Laotian problem have further weakened our ties with important allies on two continents.

Fact No. II: In no quarter of the globe can the United States point to a substantial gain in the American position in 1961 or 1962, while

on the contrary we have weakened old and trusted alliances without gaining new ones.

These facts are by no means the sum of our Nation's international problems but these are vital because they are basic. They are certain to be factors in the voters' minds in November as they weigh promises of 1960 against performances during these last 2 years.

"THE LIBERAL PAPERS"

March 15, 1962

By Senator Dirksen

Tomorrow there will be a book published by Doubleday & Co. called "The Liberal Papers." It is concerned with foreign policy and its sponsors are 12 Democratic Congressmen who 3 years ago set up what they call "the liberal project" and invited contributions from scholars and so-called foreign policy experts.

This book is an astounding product. If these published proposals of the dozen or so contributors to this Democratic-sponsored project were carried out, here is what would happen to our United States:

We would recognize Red China. We would sponsor Red China's admission to the United Nations. We would recognize as valid Red China's "claim" to Formosa and the Pescadores, ask the U.N. to administer these islands for 5 years and then hold a plebiscite to determine if the inhabitants wanted to join Red China. Meantime the United States would have offered and presumably Red China would have accepted and be receiving financial aid from our Government.

In Europe, West Germany would be demilitarized, and East Germany recognized. West Germany, Italy, "Scandinavia" and France would be encouraged by the United States to withdraw as our NATO allies. We are told we "should begin right now to close down" our missile bases throughout Europe.

Closer to home, we would make the DEW line—our radar warning system—bidirectional and invite the Soviet Union to "plug in" so they could be warned if attacked by surprise by us.

This Democratic-sponsored book could well be renamed "Our American Munich." Chamberlain surely never did as much for Hitler as is proposed here under the name of liberalism to be done for Khrushchev and Mao. We have heard much of "thunder on the right." Will we hear less now that "surrender on the left" is with us?

March 15, 1962

By Representative Halleck

The content of this Democratic-sponsored book, "The Liberal Papers," is probably best characterized by the following quotation from it:

* * * As the cold war continues, it becomes increasingly difficult for decent Americans, humane enough to prefer peace to an egocentric national honor, to be outspokenly and genuinely anti-Communist.

This is high-flown doubletalk for "better Red than dead." So the book proposes that the United States back out of Asia and Europe

with our hands up. Certainly every American is entitled to know who the sponsors of this book are.

The introduction to the book is written by James Roosevelt, Democratic Congressman from California, who was one of the leaders in setting up "the liberal project." The chairman of "the liberal project" is Robert Kastenmeier, Democratic Congressman from Wisconsin. The book suggests that, in addition to the 12 Democratic Members¹ of Congress who sponsored the project, there were 23 other Democratic Congressmen "close" to it including Chester Bowles, now President Kennedy's special representative and adviser on African, Asian, and Latin-American affairs.

Five of the original twelve sponsoring Democratic Congressmen were retired by the voters in the 1960 election, but three of them now hold jobs in the Kennedy administration. One of the assistants on this highly questionable project was Marcus Raskin, then on the staff of Representative Kastenmeier, now on the special staff of the National Security Council in the White House.

The danger in this book, "The Liberal Papers," is not that it will lead Americans to become soft on communism—we can't believe that will happen. The real menace is that it could lead not only our allies but the Communist world to doubt that we in America will stand firm or believe that any position America takes means anything.

This incredible document certainly does not strengthen the hand of our Government in the current negotiations at Geneva.

March 28, 1962

By Senator Dirksen

Since we discussed the new foreign policy book called "The Liberal Papers" at our press conference 2 weeks ago, there have been two important developments:

(1) There has been a movement of Democratic Members of the House, who were described as sponsors, to disown the book and run for cover.

(2) Research has shown that many of the radical proposals projected in "The Liberal Papers" are to be found in recent platforms adopted by the Americans for Democratic Action, that extremely liberal organization so influential in the Democratic Party and best known as the ADA.

For example, on May 14, 1961, the ADA, meeting in its 14th annual convention, paralleled the bulk of the recommendations on China which are to be found in "The Liberal Papers." The ADA proposed that the United States recognize Red China, that Red China be admitted to the United Nations, and that a plebiscite be held on Formosa to determine if the people of Nationalist China wanted to join Red China.

There were also interesting parallels between the radical proposals of "The Liberal Papers" on Europe and those of the ADA. For example, the ADA called for increased trade with Iron Curtain coun-

¹ Congressional participants in the liberal project, according to a press release from Representative Kastenmeier, Apr. 15, 1960: Robert W. Kastenmeier (Wisconsin), chairman; Byron Johnson (Colorado); George Kasen (California); Clom Miller (California); William Meyer (Vermont); William Moorhead (Pennsylvania); James O'Hara (Michigan); Charles Porter (Oregon); Henry Reuss (Wisconsin); James Roosevelt (California); Frank Thompson (New Jersey); Len Wolf (Iowa). Marcus G. Raskin was the group secretary.

tries, recognition of East Germany in exchange for guaranteed Western access to Berlin, and the withdrawal of the United States from foreign bases "whose provocative nature is found to outweigh their security value * * *".

We can only conclude that the powerful liberal wing of the Democratic Party has no conception of the scope and intensity of the world Communist conspiracy or of what constitutes the best interests of the United States. There are at least 35 members or former members of the ADA now holding high positions in the Kennedy administration, including 10 members of the President's Cabinet and sub-Cabinet.

With the significant desertions in the House, we have witnessed "The Liberal Papers" turn into "the runout papers." We would suggest that those of ADA persuasion now serving in the Kennedy administration might likewise disown the extreme positions taken by the ADA on matters of foreign policy.

(The following background information was released with Senator Dirksen's statement:)

LIST OF ADMINISTRATION OFFICIALS WHO ARE NOW, OR HAVE BEEN,
MEMBERS OF ADA

- Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture.
- Arthur Goldberg, Secretary of Labor.
- Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.
- G. Mennen Williams, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs.
- Philip Coombs, Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs.
- George L. P. Weaver, Assistant Secretary of Labor for International Affairs.
- Esther Peterson, Assistant Secretary of Labor.
- Wilbur J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (for Legislation).
- Charles Murphy, Under Secretary of Agriculture.
- Henry H. Fowler, Under Secretary of the Treasury.
- Frederick Belen, Assistant Postmaster General (Bureau of Operations).
- Archibald Cox, Solicitor General of the United States.
- Adlai Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.
- Thomas K. Finletter, U.S. Ambassador to NATO.
- J. Kenneth Galbraith, U.S. Ambassador to India.
- James Loeb, Jr., U.S. Ambassador to Peru.
- Chester Bowles, the President's Special Representative and Adviser on African, Asian, and Latin American Affairs, Ambassador at Large.
- Theodore Sorensen, Special Counsel to the President.
- Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., Special Assistant to the President.
- Harris L. Wofford, Special Assistant to the President.
- Robert C. Weaver, Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Jack T. Conway, Deputy Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Katie Louchheim, consultant to the State Department on women's activities.

Jonathan B. Bingham, U.S. representative on U.N. Trusteeship Board.

Frank W. McCulloch, Chairman, National Labor Relations Board.

Charles Donahue, Labor Department Solicitor.

Mrs. Jim G. Akin, HEW congressional liaison officer.

Robert G. Lewis, Deputy Administrator for Price and Production.

John A. Baker, Director, Agriculture Credit Services.

Charles S. Stoddard, Director, Technical Reviews Staff (Interior).

William L. Taylor, Special Assistant for Liaison, Commission on Civil Rights.

Sidney H. Woolner, Commissioner of Community Facilities Administration.

George Docking, Director of the Export-Import Bank of Washington

Howard Morgan, Federal Power Commissioner.

Philip Elman, Federal Trade Commissioner.

Source: Los Angeles Times, September 3, 1961, a series of articles by Robert Hartmann, Times Washington bureau chief.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN

February 20, 1962

By Senator Dirksen

On three occasions last year (May 11, June 8, and August 15) the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership urged President Kennedy to reexamine U.S. policy on the Geneva negotiations with the Soviet Union so that we might resume nuclear testing.

On September 1, 1961, the Soviet Union seized the initiative and began a series of 40 to 50 nuclear tests in the atmosphere. Three weeks later, the United States resumed testing, not in the atmosphere but by the far less effective method of underground explosions.

When the negotiations began in 1958, the United States had unquestioned superiority over the Soviets in both atomic devices and a bomb stockpile. Now top officials of our Government are agreed that (1) the Russians were probably testing underground all along, as we asserted in an August 15 statement, and (2) the Russians have made definite gains on us by both their clandestine and public testing.

We now ask: How much longer does President Kennedy intend to wait to resume atmospheric testing? In the past 8 months there have been numerous stories in the newspapers that Mr. Kennedy was shortly going to order such testing resumed. In fact, there are similar stories in the papers now. But we still have not resumed atmospheric testing.

What kind of leadership is this? Where is the "direct vigorous" action on this problem that Mr. Kennedy promised in the 1960 Presidential campaign? In its 13 months in office the Kennedy ad-

ministration has done nothing but give ground to the Russians both at the negotiating table and on our own atomic weapons program.

The time for action is long overdue. President Kennedy should delay not one minute longer.

February 20, 1962

By Representative Halleck

We cannot stress too much how serious we believe our nuclear weapons position to be. We believe the policy of the Kennedy administration in delaying testing has been wrong.

One of the first acts of the Kennedy administration was to weaken, in the eyes of the world, our military emphasis on massive nuclear retaliation, by a highly publicized buildup of our conventional forces.

Reserves were called up and National Guard units mobilized and they patriotically responded, but even the Pentagon now concedes this course was a mistake. Concurrently, in the field of nuclear negotiations with the Russians at Geneva, the first act of the Kennedy administration was to offer the Russians seven major concessions. The Soviets countered as might be expected—they renounced two agreements that had already been reached under the Eisenhower administration.

Meantime, despite bipartisan demands in Congress for U.S. resumption of nuclear testing, and even predictions that the President would do this, he still delayed. President Kennedy still wanted to negotiate, even though 39 months at the conference table had only gained time for the Russians.

With the door wide open, with the United States adopting a new emphasis on ground warfare, was it any wonder that the Soviet Union openly resumed atmospheric tests last September?

And still we wait, and still we go on offering concessions, the latest being an offer to transfer the nuclear talks to the agenda of a disarmament conference—a proposal sponsored by the Soviets for many months.

If we are to maintain American prestige, if we are to stay ahead on the military front, we say the President must order whatever atmospheric nuclear testing is necessary to meet our national security requirements.

(The following background information was released with Senator Dirksen's and Congressman Halleck's February 20 statements:)

NUCLEAR TEST BAN FACT SHEET

- Part I. Kennedy Pledge
- Part II. Kennedy Record on Negotiations
- Part III. Kennedy Record on Testing

PART I: THE KENNEDY PLEDGE

"* * * when I am elected, I will direct vigorous negotiations, in accordance with my personal instruction on policy, in the hope of concluding a realistic and effective agreement * * *

"* * * I intend to prescribe a reasonable but definite time limit within which to determine whether significant progress is being made * * *." (From a published letter from Democratic Presidential Nominee John F. Kennedy to Thomas E. Murray, exmember of the Atomic Energy Commission, Oct. 9, 1960.)

PART II: THE KENNEDY RECORD ON NEGOTIATIONS

March 21, 1961.—American delegate Arthur Dean presents seven major concessions on nuclear test ban to Soviet Union, but before he could make the presentation, the Soviets announced they were renouncing two agreements already made under the Eisenhower administration.

March 28, 1961.—The United States accepted Soviet demands for East-West parity in appointments of nuclear test ban policing staffs.

April 4, 1961.—The Soviets announced they would accept only two of the U.S. concessions, pointing out that they had originated these in the first place.

April 13, 1961.—The Soviets demanded the right to veto any American experiments in underground research program.

April 18, 1961.—The United States presented the 292d Geneva meeting a 15,000 word treaty for Soviet consideration.

April 19, 1961.—The Soviets rejected the U.S. treaty proposal because of disagreement over inspection proposal.

May 3, 1961.—Having called delegate Dean home for Presidential consultation, White House sources indicated Dean would return in a few days to press further for a test ban agreement.

May 31, 1961.—United States made another concession, dropping a demand for a minimum of 20 annual inspections to 12.

August 10, 1961.—President Kennedy, on the day following Premier Khrushchev's announcement that the Soviets were capable of exploding a 100-megaton bomb, disclosed he would send delegate Dean back to Geneva on August 24 to seek a "decisive" showdown with the Russians.

September 9, 1961.—Negotiations suspended by joint United States-British-Soviet resolution as a result of Soviet resumption of atmospheric testing.

November 15, 1961.—United States, with Great Britain joining, sent offer to Soviet to resume negotiations at Geneva.

November 21, 1961.—Soviet accepted offer to reopen negotiations.

November 28, 1961.—Negotiations resumed.

January 15, 1962.—President Kennedy told a press conference the "most disappointing event" in his first year has been "our failure to get an agreement on * * * testing."

January 16, 1962.—United States, with Britain joining, offered to merge nuclear talks with general disarmament discussions—an old Soviet proposal.

January 26, 1962.—Soviet Union rejected the United States-British concession and insisted the Geneva test ban talks continue.

January 29, 1962.—The United States and Britain proposed termination of Geneva parley but left the door open for possible resumption of talks, a possibility which the Soviet delegate immediately rejected. Conference concluded.

PART III: THE KENNEDY RECORD ON NUCLEAR TESTING

May 11, 1961.—Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership (Senator Dirksen) suggested Soviets might be testing underground and urged President Kennedy to set a terminal date on the Geneva negotiations.

June 8, 1961.—Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership (Representative Halleck), noting that two nights earlier in his broadcast to the Nation President Kennedy had said he could not find a single ray of hope in his meeting with Khrushchev for adopting a nuclear treaty, again urged a terminal date to negotiations.

June 12, 1961.—Senator Jackson, Democrat, of Washington, and Representative Holifield, Democrat, of California, of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, urged the administration to resume tests on a "talk 'n test" basis.

June 14, 1961.—Senator Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, urged the administration to resume both atmospheric and underground testing.

July 7, 1961.—Senator Bridges, Republican, of New Hampshire, urged a White House decision on test resumption.

June 17, 1961.—The United States in a note to the Soviet Union warned that the United States would have to resume testing if the Geneva deadlock continued.

June 21, 1961.—"High administration sources" said the administration was "moving rapidly" in the direction of resuming underground testing. On the same day, Premier Khrushchev stated the Soviet Union would resume tests "immediately" if the West did.

June 28, 1961.—President Kennedy directed a special scientific committee to assess whether Soviets could be conducting secret tests.

August 15, 1961.—Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership (Representative Halleck) called for the United States to resume nuclear testing stating: "While there is no absolute proof, there does exist enough information to indicate the Soviets have been testing during these negotiations * * * we can state this information is known to our highest Government officials * * *"

August 28, 1961.—Former Atomic Energy Commission Chairman Lewis Strauss urged resumption of testing.

August 31, 1961.—Soviet Union announced it would resume tests, the White House recalled delegate Dean from Geneva and the press speculated the United States would also resume tests.

August 31, 1961.—President Kennedy, calling the Soviet announcement "atomic blackmail," declared he is "entirely confident that the size of the U.S. nuclear stockpile and the capabilities of the individual weapons and delivery systems are wholly adequate for the defense of the United States and the free world."

August 31, 1961.—A bipartisan group of 13 Senators sponsored a resolution urging resumption of U.S. testing. The sponsors: Allott, Republican, of Colorado; Bridges, Republican, of New Hampshire; Butler, Republican, of Maryland; Cannon, Democrat, of Nevada; Fong, Republican, of Hawaii; Hickey, Democrat, of Wyoming; Schoepfel, Republican, of Kansas; Scott, Republican, of Pennsylvania; Smathers, Democrat, of Florida; Talmadge, Democrat, of Georgia; Thurmond, Democrat, of South Carolina; and Tower, Republican, of Texas; Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, sponsored it.

On the same day, the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership recalling its urgings for a deadline wryly commented: "Now it seems that the deadline has been reached." (Representative Halleck.)

September 5, 1961.—President Kennedy ordered resumption of underground tests.

September 11, 1961.—Former Atomic Energy Commission Chairman Strauss said: "I have no doubt Russia has been testing all along."

September 15, 1961.—Following 10 Soviet tests, 3 of them in the megaton hydrogen bomb range, the United States exploded a small weapon underground in Nevada, estimated at below 20 kilotons.

October 19, 1961.—U.S. representative to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson, declared that unless a test ban treaty is signed promptly, the United States will resume atmospheric tests.

October 24, 1961.—Following 20 atmospheric tests by the Russians Democratic Senate sources stated United States will resume atmospheric tests relatively soon.

November 2, 1961.—President Kennedy ordered preparations for resumption of atmospheric tests necessary "to maintain our responsibilities for free world security."

November 4, 1961.—Soviets complete their tests variously estimated at 31 (Moscow sources) to 40-50 (American sources) including one 60-megaton bomb.

December 23, 1961.—A New York Times Washington correspondent wrote: "The administration is turning to a belief that a resumption of (atmospheric) tests might be welcomed by many foreign nations, including neutralist countries."

December 29, 1961.—Defense Department disclosed that United States had created a task force for atmospheric tests "if and when President Kennedy orders them."

January 27, 1962.—British sources disclosed British Government would consent to U.S. use of Christmas Island in the equatorial Pacific for atmospheric tests "if judged necessary."

February 4, 1962.—New York Times military expert Hanson W. Baldwin reported "a bitter behind-the-scenes struggle about resumption of atmospheric testing is being fought in Washington."

Reviewing the several evaluations made by various U.S. nuclear experts, Baldwin said the Soviet tests showed:

"Tremendous laboratory progress in the more than 3 years of test cessation.

"Considerable progress in the development of a warhead for an anti-ballistic missile.

"Major development of lighter and more compact weapons. The Soviet yield-to-weight ratio—the packaging of high power into smaller and lighter weapons is now adjudged to be about equal to the United States. This is of high importance in the development of second and third generation missiles. The tests indicated considerable Soviet progress toward the development of compact, solid-fueled missiles like the Minuteman, and hence an increase in missile striking power and a reduction in vulnerability.

"Major progress in development of a whole family of new nuclear weapons—both tactical and strategic.

"Reduction of the amount of fissionable material needed to trigger a fusion reaction. The biggest Soviet test detonation, which was calculated at a yield of more than 55 megatons, released a far smaller amount of fission products into the atmosphere than the United States had anticipated. More fusion and less fission in a weapon could mean in time not only more but also cheaper weapons, since fusion materials are far less expensive and more plentiful than fissionable ones.

"In short, the Russian tests appear to sum up to a conclusion by most well-informed officials that the United States no longer has assurance that it has a major technological lead in atomic weapons."

February 5, 1962.—Press reports indicated United States had fired between 11 and 15 low-yield nuclear devices in 6 months of underground tests.

February 6, 1962.—Senator Jackson, Democrat of Washington said President Kennedy must resume atmospheric tests and do so shortly:

February 7, 1962.—In response to a press conference question: "Mr. President, the nuclear test question has been under consideration for some months now; could you give us some idea of the time schedule you foresee * * *?"

The President replied: "Well, we should know—the studies and the examinations and the considerations by the Government, should be, I would think, completed within the month."

February 8, 1962.—White House announced Christmas Island has been made available by the British for U.S. atmospheric testing, but offered the Soviet Union one more chance to negotiate a treaty.

February 9, 1962.—William C. Foster, Director of Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, said new information on the recent Soviet tests shows that the Russians by holding another series might pass the West in the nuclear arms race unless the West resumes tests of its own. He added that the Soviet test series showed "that the Soviet achieved substantial gains."

March 22, 1962

By Senator Dirksen

The American people are faced with a major question: Is President Kennedy's commendable stand of March 2 on resumption of atmospheric testing being watered down at Geneva to a point where our nuclear supremacy will be gravely endangered?

On March 4, 2 days after the President's speech to the Nation, Mr. William C. Foster, our chief disarmament negotiator, said we would be taking a "desperate risk" in signing a test ban treaty with the Soviets even if it contained our proposed inspection provisions. Asked about reports that the West was considering offering looser controls, Mr. Foster stated flatly that "those reports are not true"—in fact he indicated tighter controls might be necessary.

Two days ago, our ally Britain officially advised the Soviets at Geneva that it is willing to accept the "absolute minimum" in inspection to get a test ban. Britain, its spokesman said, is prepared to let Russia keep the military knowledge and gains achieved from its tests last fall if a treaty can be negotiated.

Two things occur to us, as members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership: (1) Any treaty negotiated must be approved by a two-thirds vote of the U.S. Senate, and (2) any decision to let the Soviet Union retain gains achieved by violating the test moratorium last fall would in a large measure more properly lie within the jurisdiction of the U.S. Government.

We are of the opinion that no piece of paper embracing the "absolute minimum" will receive a very warm welcome in the U.S. Senate. As President Kennedy has already pointed out on March 2, the Soviet Union "callously broke" a voluntary agreement to suspend testing. Why should we believe it would observe a more far-reaching proposal that under the best conditions has been called a "desperate risk" for us?

March 22, 1962

By Representative Halleck

The Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership is not only concerned by proposals for more concessions to the Soviet Union on nuclear problems, but we are apprehensive about new pressures to persuade the United States not to resume atmospheric testing.

The highest officials of our Government, including President Kennedy, now concede that the Soviet Union made major strides toward nullifying our nuclear supremacy when they tested last fall. It is also conceded by all possessing knowledge of our nuclear position—once more including the President—that it is essential for us to resume atmospheric testing if we are again to validate our supremacy.

It is already known that considerable conflict existed inside the Kennedy administration over the past year on whether to resume testing or not. That conflict has already cost us precious time which could have been spent preparing to test and then deciding. So we already have lost many months charged up against our national security while the President's advisers argued the inarguable—maximum security.

Now, at Geneva, pressures are being brought from the outside to dissuade us from taking a position of strength. The British are willing to forfeit to the Soviets any advantage the Russians may have gained over us by testing. Spokesmen for Brazil and India are urging us not to resume tests. In this country we have even had pickets marching on the White House.

These statements by Senator Dirksen and myself today are the sixth and seventh issued by the Republican leadership in the last 10 months urging a stronger nuclear posture. We were among the first to applaud the President's announcement on March 2 that testing would be resumed.

We now urge the President to insist firmly upon Soviet acceptance of our proposals and lacking that acceptance to allow nothing to deter him from the early resumption of tests so essential to this Nation's military security.

August 8, 1962

By Senator Dirksen

This Nation is now witnessing another example by the Kennedy administration of how *not* to deal with the Russians.

Early in 1961 the administration—as one of its first acts—dispatched American representatives to Geneva offering the Russians seven substantial concessions in the negotiations for a ban on nuclear testing. Before the Kennedy concessions could be presented, the Russians countered by repudiating two agreements obtained by the Eisenhower administration and then proceeded to reject five of the seven Kennedy concessions. Later, in May 1961, the Soviets rejected further Kennedy concessions.

This week, hat in hand, the Kennedy administration sent our negotiators back to Geneva with a new set of concessions, including a substantial relaxation of our previous demands for inspection. The new concessions got the standard Soviet reaction to all concessions:

The Russian representative threw cold water on them before they were even formally presented.

As if to further demonstrate their contempt for our concessions, the Soviets resumed high-altitude nuclear testing on the very eve of the Geneva meeting.

On October 19, 1960, as a presidential candidate, Mr. Kennedy stated that—

* * * when I am elected, I will direct vigorous negotiations, in accordance with my personal instructions on policy, in the hope of concluding a realistic and effective agreement * * *

for a ban on nuclear testing.

Making concession after concession is scarcely our idea of "vigorous negotiations," and when the concessions include proposals that would lessen the chances of detecting Soviet cheating, they begin to ring alarm bells with us.

We, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, would like to suggest to the Kennedy administration that a firmer American negotiating position might be achieved if it sent demands to Geneva instead of concessions. As it is now, the Russians demand and the United States concedes. We think this formula is hopeless and urge the President to abandon the concession course he has set in the test-ban negotiations.

August 16, 1962

By Senator Dirksen

Last week, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership protested the continuation of the Kennedy administration's policy of offering more concessions to the Russians each time negotiations on a nuclear test ban are resumed. On the same day, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York issued a thoroughly documented statement expressing a similar view.

An effort has been made to dismiss these two statements as political. Nothing could be further from the truth. We are and have been for 18 months talking about this Nation's security, not politics. Our statement last week was the eighth we have issued since April 1961 on test-ban negotiations, and on four occasions we have questioned the Kennedy policy of concessions.

We think it is time for America to wake up. The greatest single deterrent to war today is our nuclear weaponry. It has been a deterrent to war simply because we have enjoyed a margin of superiority over the Soviets.

All that the test ban negotiations have produced so far has been an opportunity for the Russians to narrow our margin of safety by resuming testing a year ago. At long last, we resumed testing this year. Now, in the midst of administration indecision on whether to complete our tests, the Russians have started another series.

We believe we should complete our current series of tests. We believe we should start a new series if necessary to maintain our nuclear superiority. We believe we should abandon the policy of offering concessions at Geneva and we deem it our duty to say so.

If our negotiators should try to contrive a nuclear test ban by an executive agreement at Geneva instead of a treaty which would re-

quire Senate ratification, there would be real trouble. We had enough of executive agreements at Yalta and Potsdam and the world is still paying for them.

We hope that fears on that score are unfounded, but as responsible Members of Congress we must say this: If an executive agreement instead of a treaty is sought at Geneva, we feel certain that Republicans will fight this effort with everything at our command. The treaty-ratifying rights of Congress must not be bypassed in any matter so vital to our national safety as our nuclear weapons.

August 30, 1962

By Representative Halleck

On Monday of this week President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan proposed a treaty with the Soviet Union calling for an unpoliced ban on nuclear testing in the atmosphere, in outer space and underwater and omitting the critical area of underground testing.

This proposal was the latest in a series of concessions and retreats which the Kennedy administration has sponsored on the test ban since it took office and to us it is as unwelcome as the other proposals which preceded it.

Why should we propose to accept less in a treaty in 1962 than we got in a voluntary moratorium in 1958? What value would an unpoliced treaty have in preventing secret preparations for future testing by the Soviets who historically regard a treaty as something to be broken, not kept?

Now that the Soviets have turned down the Kennedy-Macmillan proposal, what new concessions will we offer next? Are we pursuing a principle or a piece of paper?

We believe this retreat from the absolutely essential condition of inspection is a mistake of major dimensions. Inspection is the only certain way that Soviet duplicity, whether by testing underground or by preparations for atmospheric tests, could be detected.

Like everyone else, we want to see nuclear fallout eliminated but not at the risk of our own national security. We saw the Soviet Union use the voluntary test ban as a cover in 1961 for preparations for a series of 40 tests while we lost precious time. President Kennedy in his press conference yesterday called it a "lesson."

But what assurance have we that an unpoliced treaty will not be used by the Soviet Union in precisely the same manner? Must we learn the same tragic "lesson" twice?

In effect, we are now being told that a half loaf is better than none. We say that no agreement at all is better than a bad one.

The President said yesterday "the United States cannot be a party to any renewal of false hopes which the Soviet Government shattered last September." We agree, and we think the first step to insure against this would be to withdraw the "half a loaf" offer immediately.

THE ECONOMY

March 1, 1962

By Representative Halleck

It is becoming increasingly evident that members of the Kennedy administration cannot agree among themselves on whether economic conditions today are good or bad.

President Kennedy himself in his economic message to Congress on January 20 said: "The momentum of the economy has been restored." Walter Heller, Mr. Kennedy's chief economic adviser, says that while things aren't going too good in some sectors, this doesn't mean much in the overall picture.

If the Kennedy administration wants to restore confidence in our economy, if it wants to do something more practical and sensible than enact ineffective public works legislation, then it should take the lead by cutting back on the extravagant proposals for spending that have already been submitted to the Congress by the New Frontier.

Nevertheless, various Government departments and private agencies keep issuing figures that are not too encouraging. For example—the number of business failures increased to 15,000 for January, the highest number for that month since 1939.

The farm parity ratio for 1961 was only 79, the lowest since the depression years.

Foreclosures on FHA-guaranteed mortgages have reached their highest point since depression days—20,724 for 1961 compared to 9,332 for 1960, the last Eisenhower year. Correspondingly, there has been a 40 percent increase in foreclosures on mortgages backed by the Veterans' Administration compared to a year ago.

During the past year, 1961, unemployment hit its highest annual average since 1941—4,800,000.

Now, of course, these are not conclusive indicators, but they certainly do not reflect a healthy condition. So far this year, the only major economic remedy the Kennedy administration has advanced is the old wornout proposal for standby authority for \$2 billion in public works. It parallels the preposterous proposal to give the President authority to manipulate income taxes.

The trouble with the New Frontier is that it is dedicated to Government spending as an economic cure-all. Realistic tax reform, sound fiscal policies, sensible labor-management—agriculture programs—in these areas is the answer to our economic concerns.

June 11, 1962

By Senator Dirksen

After 18 months of New Frontier economics, it is becoming clear that the Kennedy administration has got America moving again—but in the wrong direction. The stock market crash has supplied the evidence. We think it is time to look at some hard facts.

The first and most important fact is the growth state of America's production plant on which our jobs, our income, our profits, and yes, the revenues for Government itself directly and indirectly depend.

The truth is that the United States, the most industrialized society in history is slowly losing first place in modernization to the industrial-

ized nations of Europe and to Japan. As things stand today the United States has a greater percentage of machine tools 10 years old and older than West Germany, France, Italy, or Great Britain. Western Europe last year spent almost twice as much of its gross national product on industrial modernization as we did, and Western Europe is booming and we are not.

The second important fact is this: The Kennedy administration's policies of increased Government spending, bigger Treasury deficits, bigger and bigger Federal debt, and greater powers for the Chief Executive, don't modernize our industrial plant, don't make jobs, and don't provide the money for wage increases. They have the opposite effect. Such policies discourage plant modernization, expansion of the job market, and profits. Such policies are properly called confidence killers.

Beyond doubt, a shakeout was due in the stock market. The shakeout was generally predicted and it began last December. But no one expected a \$100 billion loss to investors.

By April the downward adjustment amounted to \$25 billion. Then Mr. Kennedy, without benefit of law, used the enormous powers of the Federal Government to force withdrawal of a price increase which the steel industry thought was necessary to modernize its plant. Since that fateful day the stock market has plunged \$75 billion more. As many experts see it, Mr. Kennedy's action on steel triggered the plunge.

We believe President Kennedy not only needs to reexamine his policies, but to weigh the capability of his advisers who urge such policies, before further damage is done.

June 22, 1962

By Representative Halleck

For 6 months now the American economy has been suffering from tremors, some major, most of them minor. We've had a stock market crash, retail sales have not increased as expected, corporate profits are down and other soft spots have appeared in the economy.

Much of this economic disturbance has been attributed to lack of confidence in the Kennedy administration, particularly the sharp decline in the stock market which followed the President's intervention in the steel price episode.

As members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, we have been discussing the economic picture in our meetings for many weeks now. We think the economy is basically strong and would react strongly if the Kennedy administration would cease advancing economic novelties and contradictory forecasts and estimates.

Senator Dirksen has already discussed President Kennedy's highly questionable budgetary scheme. We also want to note the proposal advanced by the Solicitor-General, Archibald Cox, for governmental participation in wage and price decisions in basic industries. It, like the President's proposal, was followed by another drop in the stock market.

In January the President, with much fanfare, sent what he termed a balanced budget for 1963 to Congress. Now that it is evident that it will produce not a surplus, but a deficit, he and his economic advisers

are telling us that deficits can be good and a surplus bad for us. In April, the steel price intervention was justified as stopping inflation, but now, 2 months later, we are told we need deficit spending and a tax cut to give us a shot in the arm. One day the President tells us conditions are good and a few days later Ewan Clague, U.S. Commissioner of Labor Statistics, says we are heading for a recession. The contradictions abound.

As a major step toward restoring confidence, we earnestly suggest that the Kennedy administration declare a Government-wide moratorium on economic novelties and gratuitous forecasts and simultaneously bend every effort toward instilling some sanity in the Government's fiscal policies.

July 31, 1962

By Representative Halleck

We are rapidly coming to the conclusion that the American economy is in the doldrums not because it is weak, but because the Kennedy administration has spent most of its year and a half in office promoting legislation that discourages the creation of jobs and markets instead of encouraging them.

One thing is certain: The unemployment problem is not going to be solved unless productive enterprise expands and modernizes. The two chief roadblocks to industrial expansion and modernization are (1) the Federal tax laws and (2) lack of confidence in the Kennedy administration.

So far the Kennedy administration has devoted its energies to increasing Federal spending, boosting Federal payrolls, setting up White House guidelines to dictate prices and wages in private enterprise, and sponsoring legislation on urban affairs, compulsory medical insurance, aid to education, the regiment-or-ruin farm control bill and a withholding tax on interest and dividends. We say this is hardly a list to inspire confidence in the administration's intent.

As a result of these administration actions, together with President Kennedy's intervention in the steel price controversy, business indicators have been dropping and we've had a stock market crash. We question whether a "quickie" tax cut, desirable as it may seem, will solve anything as deep-seated as the problem this administration has created.

What is needed to restore confidence is an immediate reduction in Federal spending, accompanied by a thorough revision of the tax structure to encourage capital investment, to promote expansion and modernization, and to offer much needed relief to the ordinary taxpayer.

With the cost of living having reached a new alltime high in each of the last 4 months, the American people are far more concerned about the economic squeeze they face today than the New Frontier's social experiments and alleged reforms.

August 12, 1962

By the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESS

At a press conference on August 1, President Kennedy was asked:

Are you willing to match the record of your administration in the economic field with that of the last administration?

The President replied:

* * * I don't think the record of the last administration particularly from 1957 on was satisfactory. I'm not satisfied with our record and I don't think that any American ought to be * * *. But if we want to just compare statistics, we would be glad to compare it to the recession which was in effect when I took office.

We, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, find it difficult to believe that the President had examined the statistics when he made the statement, but we are nevertheless releasing the following statistical analysis which we have had prepared.

A COMPARISON OF THE 1961-62 RECOVERY AND THE RECOVERIES OCCURRING IN 1954-57 AND 1958-60

When President Kennedy invited a comparison between his economic record and the record of the Eisenhower administration, he cited a 10-percent increase in gross national product to illustrate how splendidly, as he sees it, things have progressed during his tenure.

It is not easy to see why the President should have invited this comparison for he must know that the recovery since February 1961 has been a weak one by almost any sensible comparison. This is a debate he cannot win.

Thus—

(1) The President has no reason to crow over the GNP figure he cited. It is true that GNP in *current dollars* rose by 10.2 percent from the low quarter of the 1960-61 recession to the second quarter of this year, but in comparable periods of the 1954-57 and 1958-60 recoveries the increases were 13 and 10.4 percent, respectively.

(2) Furthermore, the President used a GNP figure in *current prices* to make his comparison, which is clearly wrong. It is wrong because the prices that are relevant to this comparison have gone up more under his administration than they did in the last two recovery periods. Accordingly, when GNP is expressed, as it should be for such comparison purposes, in terms of constant prices, it is found that the increase in the Kennedy recovery was *only 7.7 percent* and that in both of the comparable periods of the two previous recoveries it was 9.8 percent.

(3) The President must also know that the 1961-62 recovery has lagged behind the two previous recoveries by almost every statistical measure that is pertinent to such comparisons. According to the latest (July) issue of *Business Cycle Developments* (prepared by the Department of Commerce), pertinent comparisons are as follows:

Percentage increases in comparable periods of specified recoveries

	1954-57	1958-60	1961-62
Nonagricultural employment.....	6.1	4.5	3.6
Industrial production.....	17.2	25.9	13.4
Retail sales.....	11.3	19.4	6.2
Business expenditures on new plant and equipment.....	10.4	7.2	8.5
Number of new business incorporations.....	15.2	40.2	7.1
Value of manufacturers' new orders (durable goods).....	47.4	24.2	34.0

(4) One cannot make a comparison as yet of the length of the present recovery with the length of the two previous ones because we do not know yet where the downturn of the present recovery will be placed. However, after only 17 months of recovery a downturn is said to be imminent, whereas the 1954-57 and 1958-60 expansions lasted 35 and 25 months, respectively.

(5) It is reported that Mr. Theodore Sorensen is saying that there has been a remarkable pickup since the low point of the 1960-61 recession in the utilization of industrial capacity. The fact is that there is nothing remarkable in the record. According to Federal Reserve estimates, only 87 percent of industrial capacity was being utilized during the second quarter of 1962. At a comparable point in the 1958-60 recovery the steel industry was shut down by a strike so that comparison would be meaningless, but in the comparable point in the 1954-57 recovery 90 percent of industrial capacity was being utilized.

(6) Finally, although the unemployment ratio has dropped since the low point of the 1960-61 recession, it has improved by only 26.6 percent whereas the improvement in comparable periods of the 1954-57 and 1958-60 recoveries was 43 percent and 38.7 percent, respectively.

(7) What is more, the improvement in the unemployment ratio in the present recovery is due mainly to the fact that there has been an actual decrease in the labor force. Seasonally adjusted, civilian labor force data show a drop of 291,000 from February 1961 to July 1962. In the comparable periods of the 1954-57 and 1958-59 recoveries there were increases of 2,892,000 and 724,000, respectively. Despite these large labor force increases in earlier recoveries (a massive increase, in fact, in the 1954-57 recovery), the number of persons unemployed fell more in the two previous recoveries than in the 1961-62 period. The pertinent figures are as follows:

(Seasonally adjusted)

	Civilian labor force	Persons unemployed
February 1961.....	71,899,000	4,968,000
July 1962.....	71,578,000	3,828,000
Increase (+) or decrease (-).....	-291,000	-1,140,000
April 1958.....	68,714,000	5,020,000
September 1959.....	68,438,000	3,588,000
Increase (+) or decrease (-).....	+724,000	-1,212,000
August 1954.....	64,363,000	3,828,000
January 1955.....	67,252,000	2,712,000
Increase (+) or decrease (-).....	+2,892,000	-1,140,000

It is clear from these comparisons that the 1961-62 recovery has been *below average*, or *subpar*, by historical comparisons. Yet the President implies it has been *better than average*.

August 16, 1962

By Representative Halleck

As members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership have said repeatedly in these press conferences there is nothing wrong with the American economy that sound leadership by the Kennedy administration couldn't correct.

President Kennedy had a real opportunity in his broadcast to the Nation this week to exert such leadership, but unfortunately he took one step forward and another step backward and ended up still standing at the starting gate.

There is no doubt whatsoever that this Nation needs its tax structure overhauled to stimulate expansion and modernization of our productive facilities to create more jobs. This is the certain way to relieve our unemployment and economic problems and we have repeatedly advocated it. Mr. Kennedy now favors it—in 1963.

There is also no doubt that confidence needs to be restored in the policies of the Federal Government by reductions in unessential spending and the elimination of deficits. An end to red ink financing is doubly necessary if taxes are to be cut, and we have repeatedly said so. Mr. Kennedy, judging by his broadcast, apparently doesn't intend a cutback in Federal spending now or in 1963. We think this is a major error.

Many economists, including some of President Kennedy's advisers, fear we are heading for a recession by the end of this year. We think a recession can be avoided if Mr. Kennedy will do two things. (1) immediately introduce a retrenchment program in the executive branch to restore confidence, and (2) send his tax message to this Congress before it adjourns so that labor, management, and investors can see now what he proposes to have enacted next year.

Disclosure of the Kennedy tax proposals could help business plan for the coming year, encourage consumer spending and make it possible for Congress to give the tax program speedy enactment in the early months of 1963. If help is really on the way, now is the time for the country to know what it will be.

October 5, 1962

By Representative Halleck

In any discussion of domestic affairs, it is certainly proper to examine what was promised in the 1960 presidential campaign and compare it to what has occurred during the 2 years the Kennedy administration has been in office.

Anyone who read a newspaper, watched TV, listened to the radio, or heard the candidate in person, certainly knows that President Kennedy's key pledge, made over and over, was "to get America moving forward" economically.

Well, what are the facts today, 2 years later?

The average unemployment rate is still running higher than when President Kennedy was elected in 1960.

The cost of living has gone up nearly every month this year and is now at an alltime high.

Business failures are 7 percent above what they were under Eisenhower.

Mortgage foreclosures are at their highest since 1939.

The farm parity ratio has hit its lowest point since 1939.

The Nation has suffered its first stock market crash since 1929 and American investors have taken more than a \$100 billion loss in the value of their stocks.

The gross national product which the President predicted would reach approximately \$570 billion this year is falling far short of that figure and will end up many billions less.

These are cold, hard economic facts. They are evidence that the American economy has not moved forward under President Kennedy and his overwhelmingly Democratic Congress but has actually slipped backward.

But these unpleasant economic facts are only part of the comparison that must be made between Mr. Kennedy's campaign promises of 1960 and the results today.

The President pledged sound fiscal policies. They have not been in evidence to date.

The Federal budget is at \$92.5 billion, the highest in peacetime history.

The Kennedy administration has already had two deficit years and is facing a third one.

The national debt has risen to \$303 billion, the highest in U.S. history, whether at peace or war.

One thing is certain: If this administration continues its present fiscal policies, it is going to have to (1) increase taxes, not lower them as has been talked, or (2) further increase the national debt.

Why do we raise these issues? Why do we talk of the state of the Nation with respect to foreign policy as Senator Dirksen has done, and with respect to the economy as I have done?

President Kennedy raised these issues himself in the 1960 presidential race. He campaigned on them. It is time the American people realized that what was so glowingly promised has not come to pass; that what Mr. Kennedy so mistakenly criticized in 1960 can be rightly criticized today under his own administration.

STEEL PRICE CONTROVERSY

April 19, 1962

By the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership

We, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, deplore the necessity for issuing this statement, but the issues involved are too compelling to be ignored.

Beyond the administrative operations of the Federal Government, it is a proper function of a President, in fact it is a duty, to help American private enterprise maintain a stable economy. In our free society he must usually find his way by persuasion and the prestige of his Office.

Last week President Kennedy made a determination that a 3½-percent increase in the price of steel would throw the American economy

out of line on several fronts. In the next 24 hours, the President directed or supported a series of governmental actions that imperiled basic American rights, went far beyond the law, and were more characteristic of a police state than a free government.

We, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, believe that a fundamental issue has been raised: Should a President of the United States use the enormous powers of the Federal Government to blackmail any segment of our free society into line with his personal judgment without regard to law?

Nine actions which followed President Kennedy's press conference of Wednesday, April 11, were obviously a product of White House direction or encouragement and must be considered for their individual and cumulative effect. They were:

1. The Federal Trade Commission publicly suggested the possibility of collusion, announced an immediate investigation, and talked of \$5,000-a-day penalties.

2. The Justice Department spoke threateningly of antitrust violations and ordered an immediate investigation.

3. Treasury Department officials indicated they were at once reconsidering the planned increase in depreciation rates for steel.

4. The Internal Revenue Service was reported making a menacing move toward United States Steel's incentive benefits plan for its executives.

5. The Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee began subpoenaing records from 12 steel companies, returnable May 14.

6. The House Antitrust Subcommittee announced an immediate investigation, with hearings opening May 2.

7. The Justice Department announced it was ordering a grand jury investigation.

8. The Department of Defense, seemingly ignoring laws requiring competitive bidding, publicly announced it was shifting steel purchases to companies which had not increased prices, and other Government agencies were directed to do likewise.

9. The FBI began routing newspapermen out of bed at 3 a.m. on Thursday, April 12, in line with President Kennedy's press conference assertion that "we are investigating" a statement attributed to a steel company official in the newspapers.

Taken cumulatively these nine actions amount to a display of naked political power never seen before in this Nation.

Taken singly these nine actions are punitive, heavyhanded, and frightening.

Although the President at his press conference made it clear that "price and wage decisions in this country * * * are and ought to be freely and privately made," there was nothing in the course of action which he pursued that supported this basic American doctrine.

Indeed, if big Government can be used to extralegally reverse the economic decisions of one industry in a free economy, then it can be used to reverse the decisions of any business, big or small, of labor, of farmers, in fact, of any citizen.

Most disturbing in its implications was the use of the FBI. Since the days of our Founding Fathers, this land has been the haven of millions who fled from the feared knock on the door in the night.

We condone nothing in the actions of the steel companies except their right to make an economic judgment without massive retaliation by the Federal Government.

Temporarily President Kennedy may have won a political victory, but at the cost of doing violence to the fundamental precepts of a free society.

This Nation must realize that we have passed within the shadow of police state methods. We hope that we never again step into those dark regions whatever the controversy of the moment, be it economic or political.

SPENDING

January 18, 1962

By Senator Dirksen

The Kennedy administration has now had 1 year in office. It certainly has had ample time to size up the mood of the country, but we can find little or nothing to indicate it has done so in either the state of the Union message or the projected budget.

The cost of Government is going to increase to \$92.5 billion, a sum greater than was spent in two of the four World War II years.

In keeping with Parkinson's "law" that in a bureaucracy, "expenses rise to meet income," an anticipated \$11 billion increase in revenues is all going to be spent except \$400 or \$500 million.

The size of the Government is, of course, going to grow in commensurate fashion—as is proved by the Presidential request for a \$10 billion increase in the national debt limit to the highest level in history, strangely not even mentioned in the Presidential message. There is to be a vast new farm program, a youth conservation corps, an increase in the acquisition of federally held lands, an expansion of public power holdings, and, of course, that new threat at the vitals of local government, a Cabinet Department on Urban Affairs. The administration is racing headlong into future deficits of enormous size by spending all income at a time of peak prosperity and by starting new programs certain to cost billions in future years, necessarily financed by borrowed money.

Truly, President Kennedy is heading us toward the Leviathan state. It does not seem to occur to the administration that the Federal Government has already become big enough—a colossus that touches the lives, the rights, and the privileges of every American man, woman, and child.

It is to be remembered that we, as Republicans, gave the President a year in which to unveil the New Frontier. It has turned out to be nothing more than a bright ribbon wrapped around the oldest and most discredited political package on earth—the centralization of power.

Although we speak only for the Republican minority, we are convinced there are Senators and Representatives on the Democratic side who will also find many of these proposals highly objectionable. This Nation was founded by the foes of authoritarian government and it will survive only through vigilance to prevent concentration of power in Washington.

March 8, 1962

By Senator Dirksen

It is doubtful if at any time in history—even in time of war—Congress has had more spending programs before it than under the Kennedy administration.

The favorite sum of money is \$1 billion—a billion a year for a fatter Federal payroll, a billion here and a billion there. For this year—\$93 billion, the biggest peacetime budget in American history.

For next year? And the next? Nobody wants to answer these questions. Budget Director Bell says the Federal budget will be \$100 billion "within a few years." Another estimate puts Government spending at \$125 billion a year by 1965.

But spending is only part of the problem. Where does the money come from for all this additional spending? Why, under the New Frontier philosophy, the Government borrows it from you and me.

Because of deficits, the national debt will shortly reach its \$300 billion legal limit and President Kennedy has already indicated he will ask Congress to raise the debt limit by \$8 billion more this spring. However, the New Frontier spenders find these limitations a bit confining, so they have come up with a new idea.

They are going to start a campaign to have no debt limit at all—then they'll really be in orbit to stay. Senator Eugene McCarthy, a Minnesota Democrat, is publicly advocating removal of the debt limit and the New York Times says Senator McCarthy speaks "the administration's mind."

Beyond doubt the New Frontier is an onward-and-upward administration—onward with the spending and upward with the debt. It's just possible that Congress might not raise the debt limit \$8 billion more this spring. That would give the onward-and-upward boys something to think about.

April 12, 1962

By Senator Dirksen

President Kennedy yesterday decried the increase in steel prices, denounced those who weren't sacrificing enough, and warned of inflation. The steel controversy must be determined by the facts. We note the emphasis has been placed on increased cost of living, but we would suggest that Mr. Kennedy is looking in the wrong place for the basic cause of inflation.

The prime factor in inflation is excessive Government spending, particularly when it entails deficit financing. The Kennedy administration not only is setting records as the biggest spending administration in peacetime history, but it has been in red ink ever since the first day it took office.

It was deficit financing and big Government spending by the previous Democratic administration which set off the inflationary spiral that cheapened the value of the American dollar to almost 50 cents. It cut the value of the savings, the pensions, and the insurance of millions of thrifty Americans almost in half.

President Kennedy last year took a projected Eisenhower budget that showed a surplus of \$1.5 billion and turned it into a deficit of \$7 billion by increased Government spending. True, some of this

deficit was caused by the Berlin crisis, but the bulk of it was caused by New Frontier spending schemes.

This January, Mr. Kennedy proposed a budget calling for \$9 billion in additional spending but he predicted increased revenue from taxes would balance the budget. Top experts doubted those figures then, and now only 90 days later it is freely predicted that instead of a balanced budget, President Kennedy will have another deficit of \$4 to \$6 billion.

Yes, we have the spenders back in office and we'll have inflation back too unless the spending stops. Apparently, everybody is supposed to make sacrifices except the New Frontier spenders.

April 12, 1962

By Representative Halleck

Last September 15, the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership issued a statement warning that if the Kennedy administration proposed a \$90 billion budget this year, as then rumored, it would present a "threat of inflation" that simply couldn't be ignored.

When the 1963 budget came it was \$93 not \$90 billion and since then we have had 24 Presidential messages to Congress telling us how the increased moneys would be spent. Here are some of the increases—all for nondefense spending—compared to 1961, the last complete fiscal year:

Agriculture, \$5.8 billion, *up* \$663 million; education, \$1.5 billion, *up* \$527 million; general government, \$2 billion, *up* \$318 million; health, labor, and welfare, \$5.1 billion, *up* \$861 million; housing and community development, \$832 million, *up* \$512 million; natural resources, \$2.3 billion, *up* \$292 million.

Now add an increase of more than \$7 billion for national defense since fiscal 1961 and the total of these Kennedy increases—mind you, just the increases—is greater than the entire cost of the Federal Government in 1940, only 22 years ago.

We had a reasonably stable cost-of-living picture for 8 years under President Eisenhower because he made every effort to hold spending to absolute essentials. But we insist that the cost of living—which has already reached an all-time high under President Kennedy—cannot long withstand the threat of inflation at this rate of increased Federal spending.

We would like to suggest a 25th Presidential message which Mr. Kennedy might profitably send to Congress. It would call for a cutback in the nondefense spending which we have listed here. We are confident it would not only help stem the threat of inflation but it would be applauded by all Americans who right now are filing out their income tax returns for April 15.

May 12, 1962

By the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership (issued following a Leadership meeting with former President Eisenhower)

Last Thursday the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership spent several hours conferring with former President

Eisenhower on what we regard as a key issue today—the incredible zest of the Kennedy administration for bigger and bigger Government with more and more power concentrated in the Chief Executive.

We believe that General Eisenhower in his press conference statement following our meeting issued a call to all thinking Americans that undoubtedly will sharpen the importance of the 1962 congressional elections. Certainly no one can deny the spenders are back in Washington.

Consider these facts:

In his first year in office President Kennedy added the equivalent of the population of Durham, N.C., to the Federal payroll—78,000. By the middle of next year the President will have added the equivalent of the population of Madison, Wis.—125,000 more. In other words in less than 2½ years he will have increased the Federal payroll by 200,000 employees at an additional cost of \$1.1 billion annually.

These employees are in every State of the Union. In fact in 30 of the 50 States the number of Federal employees exceeds the number of persons employed by the State government, this being true particularly in our biggest States, New York, California, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Ohio.

The Federal Government today occupies 359-million square feet of office space or the equivalent of 115 Chicago Merchandise Marts, which happens to be the largest privately owned office building in the world. And still the Federal Government is erecting new buildings totaling some 11.1 million additional square feet in Washington and other cities in the United States.

The fiscal picture is equally staggering. In his first year in office President Kennedy took a projected Eisenhower budget showing a surplus of \$1.5 billion and turned it into a \$7 billion deficit by increased Government spending, most of it for domestic spending schemes, not for defense. This January President Kennedy proposed another huge leap in Government spending—an increase of \$9 billion.

Today projected Government spending for the next fiscal year stands at \$92.5 billion. This sum is greater than the Federal Government spent in prosecuting two of the four World War II years.

And New Frontier economists unabashedly predict that Federal spending will cross the \$100 billion mark within a year or two.

As Mr. Kennedy's leviathan state rolls on, it should be plain to every taxpayer in America that under this administration the possibility of a tax cut is utterly hopeless and that inevitably taxes must go up, or we must resort to ruinous deficit financing and inflation, the cruelest tax of all.

General Eisenhower drew a lucid picture of the always increasing White House demands for more and more authority to be vested in the President. It is not a coincidence that the cost of Government goes up in direct proportion to the demands for more Presidential authority—in fact the first is the product of the second.

Certainly Republicans, mindful of the importance of solvency in Government and proper restraints on the powers of the executive branch, must take these issues to the American people in this election year, 1962.

Mr. Kennedy said a lot in 1960 about "getting America moving again," but to date the only thing booming is the Federal Government.

June 22, 1962

By Senator Dirksen

When things are not going good, some administrations are tempted to change the way of keeping score so that a poor performance will look better. In other years there have been suggestions that the unemployed should be counted differently, the method for computing the cost of living be changed, and so on. Now the Kennedy administration wants to tamper with budgetmaking.

President Kennedy decries our present budget methods as a "myth." He wants us to be more "sophisticated." He points out that the present method treats all expenditures as spending. He wants to distinguish "operating expenses" from "long-term investments," such as office buildings. He wants "loans" separated from outright "expenditures."

Mr. Kennedy presents this as something new but actually it is so old it has whiskers. It's the old "capital budget" idea of the early New Deal days 30 years ago. It's the same package that Adlai Stevenson's 1952 campaign finance chairman, Beardsley Ruml, used to advocate. To put it bluntly, it's an old scheme to cover up extravagant Government spending and everybody knows it.

President Eisenhower had four Directors of the Budget during his 8 years in office. They were Joseph Dodge, Rowland Hughes, Percival Brundage and Maurice Stans. Every single one of them opposed this phantom type of budgetmaking.

Mr. Stans, when he was Budget Director, went further. He asked the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants to set up a special committee to study the capital budget theory. The committee made the study and rejected the proposal.

One thing should be clear to all taxpayers: No matter how Mr. Kennedy pumps it, or how many buckets he pours it into, it will still cost just as much.

We, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, are opposed to tampering with budgetmaking. We say that in the shaky economic conditions today what we need is not "sophisticated" budgetmaking as Mr. Kennedy calls it, but some plain unsophisticated economy in the Federal Government.

August 8, 1962

By Representative Halleck

During the past weeks we have repeatedly called attention to the Federal Government's share in the blame for this Nation's current economic slump. There is no better example of wrong economic thinking than the renewed efforts of the Kennedy administration to get the House of Representatives to pass a so-called public works bill which is nothing more than a \$900 million political slush fund for the President.

Not only does this legislation have numerous basic flaws, but it is typical of the Kennedy proposals which shake public confidence in the economic policies being pursued by the White House.

First, this bill authorizes \$900 million in public works when there is already \$2.6 billion in unspent money from specific appropriations which would produce far more jobs than this public works bill.

Second, this bill would set up a whole new Government bureaucracy under a public works czar that would take away from the Congress the decisionmaking on projects.

Third, this bill would confer upon the President unprecedented powers to spend money in such amounts as he might determine for projects—whether Federal, State or local—of his own choosing in areas selected by him.

Finally, every cent of the \$900 million proposed in this bill is unbudgeted and could lead only to more red ink spending and further increases in the national debt.

It is a well-established fact that public works projects have the most doubtful value of all Government devices to relieve an economic recession because they take too long to get started and produce relatively the fewest jobs for the unemployed.

This bill, reduced to its essentials, is nothing more than a \$900 million political blank check for President Kennedy that will neither stimulate the economy nor create any significant number of jobs. It should be rejected.

TAX CUT

June 11, 1962

By Representative Halleck

We Republicans have long held that one of the greatest impediments to growth of our economy has been the Democrat policy of pumping hard-earned tax dollars out of the economy and then letting them "trickle back" minus Washington's bureaucratic cut.

We think one of the greatest errors the Kennedy administration made on taking office was to adopt the heavy spending and deficit policies of previous Democratic administrations. This action certainly has not inspired confidence, it has not reduced unemployment, and it has not done anything "to get America moving again."

Two weeks ago when Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee seeking authority to sell more Government bonds to accommodate Mr. Kennedy's deficits, he made it plain the President did not intend to cut spending. Last week Mr. Dillon announced, and President Kennedy has confirmed, that the administration now intends to seek a 1963 "top to bottom" tax cut.

Evidently this means that Mr. Kennedy intends to cut taxes and spend at the same time. We say the two are contradictory so far as promoting confidence is concerned and can only produce intolerable deficits that will further depress the economy.

Last week in our 1962 Republican statement of principles, we urged an overhaul of the Federal tax system to promote economic growth. If the Democrats are now ready to sit down and take a serious look at the "trickle back" tax policies which retard growth we will be more than glad to sit down with them and work out a sound solution.

The first approach to real savings in tax dollars must be a serious effort to control Federal spending. The American people must realize that a sound solution cannot mean giving them tax dollars with the gloved hand while a slick-fingered pickpocket called inflation steals them back.

July 10, 1962

By Representative Halleck

For the past 6 weeks there has been widespread talk of a tax cut. Secretary of the Treasury Dillon made a speech on the subject early in June, right after the stock market crash. President Kennedy discussed it in a subsequent press conference.

The program the President and Mr. Dillon talked about is to be unveiled this fall before the congressional elections for enactment next year, and presumably would cut income taxes from top to bottom, but recover about 60 percent of the lost revenue by eliminating certain tax deductions now allowed.

Of course, the Treasury Department does not confide its plans to us, but responsible financial writers and journals have reported that a Treasury Department task force headed by Assistant Secretary Stanley Surrey is considering the following proposals among others:

Elimination of the deduction allowed homeowners on their property taxes and on interest on their mortgage;

Elimination of the double personal exemption for people 65 and over;

End of the double personal exemption for the blind;

End of the exclusion for sick pay;

End of the tax free status of employer contributions to employee pension plans.

These are just a few of the proposals the Treasury Department is said to be considering. It is a question of which are the worst. For example, if the Kennedy administration intends to eliminate the income tax deduction on the homeowners' property taxes and mortgage interest payments then it will have doublecrossed every person who has subscribed to the New Frontier's 35-year housing mortgage program and every other homeowner to boot.

If the Kennedy administration intends to eliminate the double exemption for every person over 65, what kind of deal is this for people who believe they will get something free out of compulsory medical care for the aged?

We don't know whether the Treasury Department fed some of these proposals to the press on a "trial balloon" basis or not. In any case, we Republicans want to shoot the trial balloon down right now. We think American homeowners and people 65 and over deserve a better deal from the Kennedy administration than that.

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR AGED

July 19, 1962

By Senator Dirksen

It is extremely regrettable that President Kennedy has seen fit to make a political football out of medical assistance for the aged. It is a disservice to our senior citizens but at least it should give them a clear insight into New Frontier motivations.

The reasons are simple why Congress rejected the Kennedy proposal: It was unsound legislation. It did not meet the needs of the aged. There was no public demand for it, in fact mail in congressional offices and other soundings showed the American people oppose the program.

The Kennedy administration, led by the President himself, made every effort to whip up public demand for the legislation and failed miserably. In addition to the Madison Square Garden rally at which the President spoke on May 20, the New Frontier attempted to set up 32 other rallies in cities across the land. Seven of them—in Denver, Philadelphia, Dallas, San Francisco, Louisville, Atlanta, and Birmingham—had to be canceled outright for lack of interest. Other rallies were total flops with, for example, only 46 people showing up in Charleston, W. Va., in a hall seating 3,500; only 191 people in San Diego in a hall seating 2,400; only 37 people in a hall seating 2,000 in Peoria, Ill., and so on.

In addition, following the televised appearance of the President from Madison Square Garden, Congress was literally deluged with mail opposing the Kennedy approach on medical assistance for the aged.

We feel that if the Kennedy administration had spent half as much effort stimulating the Kerr-Mills Act already on the Federal statute books to provide medical assistance for the aged, this law would today be operating successfully in 50 States instead of in 24 States.

President Kennedy has just named, subject to Senate confirmation, Anthony Celebrezze to be the new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department charged with administering the Kerr-Mills Act. Mr. Celebrezze will, of course, be confirmed, but it is our intention when his name comes up for confirmation to urge upon him the utmost diligence in carrying out the existing statute. This is the clear responsibility of Mr. Celebrezze and the Kennedy administration.

ESTES SCANDAL

May 3, 1962

By Senator Dirksen

On March 29, 1962, one Billie Sol Estes, a 37-year-old resident of Pecos, Tex., was arrested, charged with a maze of alleged frauds. These frauds probably exceed \$30 million. They reach into many States.

Many of the millions which passed through his hands were directly out of the U.S. Treasury. They were in the form of grain storage fees. They were from the illegal acquisition of cotton acreage allotments under the Federal Government's farm program.

More than a month has now gone by. There is little evidence of investigation by the Department of Agriculture, and even less by the Congress, where the Agriculture Committees of the Senate and House have failed to act. Apparently the lid is on.

Letters of inquiry to the Department of Justice and the Agriculture Department from Members of both the Senate and House have either been unsatisfactorily answered or not answered at all. What information has been available has been produced by Texas newspapers and the attorney general of Texas who has had to labor under great handicaps because he had no power to subpoena necessary evidence outside his State.

We are convinced the manipulations of Mr. Estes are only a glaring symptom of a basic sickness—a sickness that has attached itself to the billions in handouts from the Agriculture Department. There are

a dozen or more programs under the Agriculture Department that involve large outlays of money. They are subject to much the same loose management which enabled Mr. Estes to pyramid his fraudulent operations into tens of millions of dollars.

We, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, believe an all-out congressional investigation into the Department of Agriculture is mandatory. If there are any jurisdictional conflicts between committees of either the Senate or the House or between the Senate and the House, then we say a special joint investigating committee should be established without further delay.

The inquiry into the Department of Agriculture should be a non-partisan investigation. If it reaches into any previous administration, let it reach.

This is the only way Congress can perform its basic duty of reviewing existing statutes to determine what corrective steps are necessary to prevent such scandals in the future.

May 3, 1962

By Representative Halleck

Inescapably all Federal subsidy programs invite mismanagement, favoritism, and even fraud unless they are kept under the closest supervision by the Congress. Wherever such abuses occur the intended beneficiaries are cheated and congressional intent is frustrated.

Only last year we witnessed the experience of Secretary Freeman's Department in the feed grains program. The Department paid for the retirement of 20 million acres of cornland but actually only 15 million were taken out of production. The 5 million phantom acres cost the U.S. Treasury \$150 million for which nothing was received in return.

Senator John Williams of Delaware 2 weeks ago introduced a resolution seeking an inquiry by the Senate Committee on Agriculture. Representative Robert Dole of Kansas introduced a similar resolution seeking an inquiry by the House Committee on Agriculture. Apparently neither the Senate nor the House committees intends to act.

Congress has reached a sorry state when its Members have to depend on newspapers to gather facts which it should now be seeking. We regret to say that we were forced to put together a book of 200 pages of clippings, mostly from the Dallas News, concerning the Estes case in an effort to form some conclusions. Fortunately we have in the last few days been able to open some other channels of information.

The Republican leadership today advised former President Eisenhower by phone of our demand for a full-scale investigation. His instant reaction was exactly what you would expect. He was pleased to learn that we are taking every step open to us to bring before the Congress and the American people all the facts, regardless of the years, the individuals, or the administrations involved.

The Estes case in itself is a major scandal and of course should be investigated. However, it is the considered opinion of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership that the financial operations of the Department of Agriculture should be given the closest scrutiny by the Congress and that the inquiry should start immediately.

FEED GRAINS PROGRAM

March 28, 1962

By Representative Halleck

The problem of "phantom" acres in the Kennedy administration's feed grain program was discussed by the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership today. Typical of the complaints of mismanagement of this program was a letter we considered which I received from a farmer, John A. Albertson, who lives near Monticello, Ind., in my district. Here is what this farmer wrote:

I am enclosing two (Agriculture Department) notices offering to pay me for not growing crops on land which has not grown corn for at least 6 years; has not been planted to any crop since the U.S. marshal confiscated an Indiana farmer's tractors for growing too much wheat some 3 years ago; has not been owned by me for over a year; and which has been platted and dedicated as a subdivision for at least a year.

I mention this only to show the laxity with which the farm program is operated. I think it is past time for a congressional investigation of the abuses practiced in this program. If a careful check were made to pay only for retiring land actively in cultivation I am sure the cost of this program could be cut in half.

For many months we, along with other Republican Members of the Senate and the House, have been protesting the unbelievable amounts of money the Kennedy administration has been spending to keep corn from being grown on acres which do not exist. The New Frontier paid out \$680 million to reduce corn acreage by 20 million acres last year. Although it paid for 20 million acres, it actually only retired some 15 million acres from production.

These 5 million "phantom" acres cost the U.S. taxpayers \$150 million—money absolutely wasted. Having experienced this fiasco, you would think that the Kennedy administration would have straightened things out for 1962. Not at all. The estimates are the Kennedy administration will purchase another 5 million phantom acres this year at the same approximate loss of \$150 million. That would total \$300 million wasted in 2 years.

We agree with Farmer Albertson that the time has come for a congressional inquiry into this laxity and mismanagement by the Kennedy administration in the field of agriculture and we will encourage our fellow Members to support such an inquiry.

INVESTIGATION OF PRESS

July 19, 1962

By Representative Halleck

We have all been long aware of the New Frontier's sensitivity to the press and the communications industry generally. Newton Minow, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, kicked things off last year with his charge that television programming was a "vast wasteland," and conducted hearings attempting to prove it.

At various times the White House has shown its displeasure over coverage of news and social events. President Kennedy, who in the 1960 campaign, promised to hold news conferences once a week if elected President, has been holding them less and less. His press secretary, Pierre Salinger, has complained that fewer stations have been carrying the televised news conferences and has urged press aids to Democratic Senators and Congressmen to put some pressure on the delinquents back home.

Now the New Frontier is about to open fire on a new sector. Representative Emanuel Celler, Democratic chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, says that as soon as Congress adjourns, his committee will begin hearings on monopoly in the newspaper field, the operations of newspaper chains and wire services, the suburban press, radio and television reporting, and the impact of syndicated columns on the handling of local news.

We are told witnesses will include representatives of the Justice Department and the Federal Trade Commission, as well as some Members of Congress.

We believe the House Judiciary Committee has every right to investigate monopolistic practices in any field, including the newspaper field, but only to determine if corrective legislation is needed. But this sounds more like a three-ring circus at the expense of the press and the taxpayer than an inquiry into the business practices of the news media. We have already seen the FBI used to rout newspaper reporters out of bed in the small hours of the night. We suggest that was one New Frontier blunder too many. Mr. Celler might well curtail his inquiry to matters properly within his committee's jurisdiction.

CIVIL RIGHTS

January 30, 1962

By Senator Dirksen

When the Senate convenes today, I shall join the majority leader, Senator Mansfield, as cosponsor of the legislation to eliminate discriminatory use of literacy tests in qualifying to vote in Federal elections.

This step is being taken because of a section contained in the 1960 Republican platform pledging, "legislation to provide that the completion of six primary grades in a State-accredited school is conclusive evidence of literacy for voting purposes."

This legislation is going to need solid support if we are to make it law. I regret to say the whole civil rights program has been endangered by President Kennedy's unfortunate handling of the proposal to create a new Federal bureaucracy to be known as the Department of Urban Affairs. It is backfiring at this very moment.

The difficulty with attempting to place the Republican Party in the position of opposing civil rights is simply a matter of legislative record and I am not surprised that the White House should attempt such a political maneuver. The facts are that the Republican legislative record is far, far superior to the Democrats on civil rights. Here are the facts:

Since 1933 there have been 26 major votes in the Senate on civil rights. In more than 80 percent of those votes there has been a Democratic majority against civil rights; in all but 1 of those 26 votes there were heavy Republican majorities for civil rights.

In the same period of time there have been 20 major votes in the House on civil rights, and in 9 of those 20 votes the Democrats could not even muster a majority for civil rights, while the Republicans voted anywhere from 68 to 100 percent favorable on every single vote.

That is the record. As to this legislation covering literacy tests, it is far less than Mr. Kennedy himself promised during the 1960 campaign that he would enact last year, not this year. We propose to help Mr. Kennedy put it through Congress, if the Democrats can put their own ranks in order.

(The following data were released with Senator Dirksen's January 30 statement:)

THE CIVIL RIGHTS VOTING RECORD OF REPUBLICANS VERSUS DEMOCRATS, 1933-62

When it comes to actual votes in Congress on civil rights, which party is the one friendly to Negroes?

The record proves it to be the Republican Party.

Despite all the ballyhoo of Democrats, the truth is that if proportionately as many Democrats as Republicans voted in favor of civil rights legislation in Congress, then civil rights legislation could be passed.

The following table proves it. Out of 26 Senate votes, it shows how a *majority* of Senate Democrats have voted *against* civil rights issues in *every single case except 2 since 1933*. In two cases not a single Democrat voted favorably; in two others, only a lone Democrat joined a majority of Republicans seeking favorable action.

At the same time, in *every single Senate vote except one*, a majority of *Republicans* voted in *favor* of civil rights issues—in five cases by 100 percent.

In the House, the Republicans have likewise consistently outvoted the Democrats in proportion to their strength—*Republicans voting 68-100 percent favorable to civil rights* on every single vote, while the Democrats have failed in 9 out of 20 votes to muster a majority in favor. Here is the record:

Percent favorable votes of each party's members present and voting on civil rights issues, 1953-62

ANTIDISCRIMINATION (INCLUDING FEPC)

Date of vote	Senate		Date of vote	House	
	Republican	Democrat		Republican	Democrat
Jan. 17, 1946.....	95	61	Feb. 21, 1946.....	94	55
Feb. 9, 1946.....	76	44	Apr. 4, 1949.....	68	47
Apr. 21, 1949.....	78	7	Feb. 25, 1950.....	68	48
Do.....	63	7	Feb. 23, 1950.....	73	45
May 3, 1949.....	69	0	June 4, 1951.....	80	51
May 21, 1949.....	90	47	July 23, 1956.....	94	52
May 19, 1950.....	65	42	June 28, 1957.....	90	52
June 21, 1950.....	67	39	Do.....	74	50
July 12, 1950.....	65	45	Sept. 15, 1959.....	91	66
June 20, 1957.....	67	34	Mar. 24, 1960.....	90	66
July 24, 1957.....	60	27	Apr. 28, 1960.....	93	6
Aug. 7, 1957.....	100	62			
Do.....	73	39			
Sept. 14, 1959.....	97	72			
Apr. 8, 1960.....	100	70			
Aug. 9, 1960.....	93	7			

ANTIPOLL TAX

Date of vote	Senate		Date of vote	House	
	Republican	Democrat		Republican	Democrat
Aug. 25, 1942.....	100	47	Oct. 13, 1942.....	97	61
Nov. 20, 1942.....	87	42	May 25, 1943.....	91	49
May 15, 1944.....	58	35	June 12, 1945.....	87	47
July 21, 1946.....	68	47	July 21, 1947.....	100	47
Jan. 18, 1950.....	55	0	Do.....	94	43
			July 26, 1949.....	82	50
			Do.....	88	62

ANTILYNCHING

Date of vote	Senate		Date of vote	House	
	Republican	Democrat		Republican	Democrat
July 26, 1937.....	63	20	Apr. 15, 1937.....	90	61
July 21, 1937.....	100	54	Jan. 10, 1940.....	95	47
Jan. 6, 1938.....	100	69			
Feb. 21, 1938.....	71	18			
Jan. 18, 1939.....	58	2			

January 30, 1962

By Representative Halleck

We are against a Department of Urban Affairs because it is wrong in principle, disruptive in practice. The States are the appropriate units through which the Federal Government should deal with local problems, not the cities. This proposal not only will bring 75 million Americans under direct Federal supervision, but will bring about the rapid erosion of the Federal-State system.

President Kennedy has known all along that he could not get his own Democrat Congress to approve a Department of Urban Affairs because there is neither need for nor merit to the idea.

His resort to what has been described in the press as a "clever political move"—by injecting civil rights into a proposal so far reaching

in its implications—is supposedly designed to force Republicans to abandon principle for votes in the next election.

We submit that rather than a maneuver to put Republicans on the spot with respect to civil rights, the real purpose of Mr. Kennedy's move is to take Democrats off the spot.

Let me document that statement.

On April 28, 1960, during House consideration of a housing bill, Republicans sponsored an amendment which banned discrimination in this field. There were 235 votes recorded against that amendment, almost all of them Democratic votes, including the present Democratic leadership in the House.

On September 9, 1960, 5 months later, in a campaign speech in Los Angeles, Candidate Kennedy said, and I quote:

* * * as Chief Executive, the next President must be prepared to put an end to racial and religious discrimination in every field of Federal activity, by issuing the long-delayed Executive order putting an end to racial discrimination in federally assisted housing.

It is bad enough that Mr. Kennedy has gone back on his own pledge to the people who voted for him on the basis of this statement.

It is even worse that as the President of all the people he is now employing sham tactics in an effort to cover Democratic shortcomings on the civil rights issue.

