

A RECORD OF PRESS CONFERENCE
STATEMENTS

MADE BY

SENATOR EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

AND

REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD

FOR

THE JOINT SENATE-HOUSE
REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP



PRESENTED BY MR. DIRKSEN

OCTOBER 22, 1965.—Ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1965

THE JOINT SENATE-HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP

FOR THE SENATE

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, *Leader*
THOMAS H. KUCHEL, *Whip*
BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, *Chairman of the Policy Committee*
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, *Chairman of the Conference*
THRUSTON B. MORTON, *Chairman of the Republican Senatorial Committee*

FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

GERALD R. FORD, *Leader*
LESLIE C. ARENDS, *Whip*
MELVIN R. LAIRD, *Chairman of the Conference*
JOHN J. RHODES, *Chairman of the Policy Committee*
H. ALLEN SMITH, *Ranking Member, Rules Committee*
BOB WILSON, *Chairman, Republican Congressional Committee*
CHARLES E. GOODELL, *Chairman, Committee on Planning and Research*

PRESIDING OFFICER

RAY C. BLISS, *the Republican National Chairman*

FOREWORD

This legislative year marks the fifth year of existence of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership established at the suggestion of President Dwight D. Eisenhower in January 1961.

The format remains that of issuing policy statements on subjects both foreign and domestic, usually in the form of a press conference by Senator Dirksen and Representative Ford. Occasionally, releases were made without the press conference or by some other member of the Leadership.

The membership was increased by one member this year with the addition of the Chairman of the Committee on Planning and Research, Charles E. Goodell. During the session the Leadership was saddened by the passing of Clarence J. Brown, one of the original members of the Joint Leadership. Representative H. Allen Smith thereby succeeded to the Leadership as ranking member of the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives. During the year the meetings were presided over by Republican National Committee Chairman Dean Burch and his successor Ray Bliss.

During this year Robert Humphreys, who served with great devotion and efficiency as the Staff Consultant of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership since its inception, was granted a leave of absence because of a lingering illness. Mr. Humphreys died on October 15. The Joint Leadership mourns the passing of this irreplaceable colleague. At the time of his death, columnist David Lawrence paid him this richly deserved tribute: " * * * he made a deep impression here in the National Capital as an honest and conscientious worker in the field of politics * * * he was one of those anonymous workers whose services over the years have been invaluable to the Republican Party."

The members of the Joint Leadership are members of the Republican Coordinating Committee, a new idea in party politics. During this session the Coordinating Committee held three sessions, formed five task forces, and approved three task force reports. All indications are that the Republican Coordinating Committee will continue as a positive force in the examination of party policy and party operations.

As in previous years, the Leadership statements for 1965 are being published as a Senate document. They appear on the following pages and are indexed as to the issue covered.

CONTENTS

	Page
Berlin wall.....	1
Cost of living.....	1
Cuba.....	3
Economy, the.....	4
Education.....	6
Eighty-ninth Congress, 1st session, a commentary.....	6
Foreign affairs, conduct of.....	8
"Great Society".....	9
Latin America.....	10
"Peaceful coexistence".....	11
Poverty.....	12
Reapportionment.....	14
Republican Coordinating Committee.....	15
Taft-Hartley 14(b).....	17
Unemployment.....	18
United Nations.....	19
Vietnam.....	20

A RECORD OF PRESS CONFERENCE STATEMENTS

BERLIN WALL

August 13, 1965

By the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership

August 13 marks the fourth anniversary of a tragedy in American foreign relations and a tragedy for all mankind—the erection of one of man's most hated and degrading structures, the Berlin wall. The wall is an insult to all of mankind. It is an ugly reminder that the Communists cannot command the voluntary allegiance of those trapped by terrible circumstance within their borders.

In 1961, the Communists violated the Four Power Agreement, a pledge among nations, and they violated man's sense of individual diversity, a pledge among all men, when they constructed their cold cement edifice. Now, 4 years afterward, the wall has been warmed many times over by the blood of courageous, imprisoned men who have sought escape from mistrust, compulsion by force, and deadening conformity.

The lust for freedom of the east German people has sent unnumbered hundreds under, through, and over the wall in quest of this freedom. In order to join with their families and friends in the West and escape the tyranny of Communist government, these men have matched bravery and ingenuity against the fiendish traps and obstacles concocted by the Communists. Many German people have died by the bullets of Communist rifles when they sought to escape.

It is a great irony that man's response to the wall, the escape, has become one of the most meaningful and important actions to all freedom-loving men. We feel a common bond with the stifled individuals behind the wall, and every freeman identifies with the individuals who are compelled by conscience and blessed with the opportunity to escape.

Tragically, as more men have escaped and more men have died, the wall has been fortified and enlarged with cement, wire, and explosives. Yet one remains confident that the bravery and genius of such men will not be defeated by a wall.

The return of freedom and unity to all the German people must remain a major objective of the foreign policy of the United States until the wall is no more.

COST OF LIVING

August 5, 1965

By Senator Dirksen

The most recent figures on the cost of living convey disheartening news. For the third month in a row a substantial increase in living

costs were registered. The increase to date in 1965 has been four times the increase during the same period of 1964.

The month of June showed the biggest increase in 23 months. Food prices alone rose 2 percent. The meat, poultry, and fish group was up 10 percent from a year ago.

Foodstore prices in the Washington area bring these statistics to life. For instance, in one chainstore since June 1964 the cost of smoked ham has risen from 43 cents per pound to 59 cents per pound. At another chainstore, the past 13 months have seen a rise in the cost of rib steaks of 22 cents per pound, while boneless chuck roast has zoomed from 49 cents per pound to 85 cents per pound. Pork chops at another chainstore have nearly doubled in price, from 69 cents per pound in June of 1964 to today's price of \$1.19 per pound. The same store in the same period has seen bacon more than double in price, from 49 cents to \$1.05 per pound.

There are signs of continued pressures affecting not only the price of food but also a broad range of commodities and services. Wholesale prices, following a 6-year period of stability, have risen 2 percent in the past year. On top of this, the Labor Department reports that in the first 6 months of this year the increases granted in wage settlements have averaged 4 percent—well above the administration's guidepost of 3.2 percent. And that will tend to push prices up even more.

In spite of these disquieting signs, the press reports that "Administration spokesmen * * * said they were not worried by the recent surge in consumer prices." These sentiments are not shared by the American housewife, the wage earner with a family to feed, the poor, the retired, and others who live on fixed incomes. Perhaps the President should be reminded of that portion of his state of the Union message in which he said, "Our continued prosperity demands continued price stability."

The inflationary trend offsets the billions being expended in the highly publicized war on poverty.

Food prices in Washington, D.C., chainstores

	June 1964	July 1965
Chainstore A:		
Fryers:		
Legs (per pound).....	80.37	\$0.55
Breasts (per pound).....	.43	.59
Smoked ham, fully cooked (per pound).....	.43	.59
Medium fresh shrimp.....	.69	.99
2 dozen large eggs.....	.91	.95
Chainstore B:		
Chuck roast, boneless (per pound).....	.49	.85
Fryers:		
Whole (per pound).....	.25	.39
Cut.....	.25	.43
Rib steaks, 7-inch cut (per pound).....	.57	.79
Chainstore C:		
Pork chops (per pound).....	.69	1.19
Bacon (per pound).....	.49	1.05
Chainstore D:		
Porterhouse steak, USDA Choice (per pound).....	.95	1.69
Round steak (per pound).....	.79	1.35

CUBA

May 20, 1965

By Representative Gerald R. Ford

Today is the 63d anniversary of Cuban independence. On May 20, 1902, Cuba assumed the status of an independent Republic with the inauguration of its first president.

On this anniversary, we call for the reestablishment of Cuba's independence. Since late 1960 the present government of Cuba has been a military, economic, and political vassal of the Soviet Union. Today thousands of foreign Communist military personnel remain on Cuban soil. Cuba's rulers continue to serve the purposes of an alien system by carrying on a campaign of terrorism, sabotage, subversion, and sporadic warfare against their neighbors, disturbing the peace of the hemisphere and threatening the security of all American nations.

The policy objective of the present administration toward the Communist government of Cuba has been ambiguous. At times it has been described as "to get rid of the Castro regime and of Soviet Communist influence in Cuba." So Mr. Johnson declared at Midland, Tex., on September 30, 1962. At other times it has been described as "to isolate Cuba * * * to frustrate its efforts to destroy free governments and to expose the weakness of Communism so that all can see." So it was formulated by President Johnson on April 20, 1964.

The melancholy events in the Dominican Republic are a forceful reminder that neither objective has been attained. Cuba has not been isolated, nor is it rid of Castro and Soviet Communist influence. Cuba is the breeding ground for Communist subversion throughout this hemisphere.

President Johnson's recent statement that we "cannot permit the establishment of another Communist government in the Western Hemisphere" clouds the purposes of administration policy toward Cuba still further.

The administration should fix clearly so that all can see the objective of its policy toward Cuba. The isolation of the Castro regime and the prevention of the export of communism from Cuba should be pursued more vigorously as an immediate policy objective. But the ultimate objective can be nothing less than the elimination of the Communist government of Cuba and the restoration of independence under a government freely chosen by the Cuban people.

This objective is dictated by policies subscribed to by all the nations of the hemisphere at Caracas in 1954. The Caracas Declaration stated:

* * * the domination or control of the political institutions of any American State by the international Communist movement, extending to this Hemisphere the political system of an extracontinental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American States, endangering the peace of America. * * *

In compliance with this doctrine, President Eisenhower said on July 9, 1960:

• • • Nor will the United States in conformity with its treaty obligations, permit the establishment of a regime dominated by international communism in the Western Hemisphere.

It is time to reaffirm this as our national purpose and the purpose of the other American nations.

THE ECONOMY

July 1, 1965

By Senator Hickenlooper

The health of the economy has become a matter of concern and debate since William McChesney Martin pointed out some similarities between present conditions and those of 1929. The President and other administration spokesmen, emphasizing the bright spots in the economic picture, have suggested that anything wrong in the economy results from fright caused by Mr. Martin's speech.

We find it hard to understand how an administration that has been talking constantly of the poverty in the United States can blame Mr. Martin's qualified warning for weakening confidence in the economic system.

A balanced appraisal of the performance of the economy should begin with a recognition of the fact that the period since World War II has been one of steady and sustained economic growth. Downturns have been few, short, and moderate. We should not expect only guaranteed and sustained rises in economic activity for the future, but the attitude that "things are so good they can't continue" is probably too nearsighted.

Nevertheless, there are danger signals in some economic indicators. To ignore them, to sweep them under the rug, or to denounce those who point them out is shortsighted.

The international financial situation is one of the most ominous clouds on the economic horizon. The administration's program of "voluntary coercion" in the balance-of-payments area is based on the same principle of political expediency as so much of its domestic economic wheeling and dealing. In the process of instituting short-run remedies, the President is following a practice of giving glib and pat answers to serious and involved questions. In imposing more and more controls over international trade and capital flows, the administration is abandoning the principle of liberalized multilateral trade embodied in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and supported by the United States throughout the Eisenhower years, in the face of adversity encountered by almost all of our trading partners. If this series of shortsighted treatments for the symptoms in our balance of payments produces serious dislocations in major foreign economies, the United States will not remain unscathed.

We believe that an International Monetary Conference should be called to deal with the basic structural shortcomings of our international monetary system. The problem is one which cannot be further neglected.

July 1, 1965

By Representative Gerald R. Ford

Certain strategic imbalances have developed in the domestic economy. Although more than 4½ percent of our labor force remains unemployed, distinct inflationary pressures are evident. Indeed, we are greatly concerned about eroding price increases in view of the employment situation. In particular, nothing seems to succeed in helping young labor force participants—the teenager jobless rate remains close to 15 percent. Yet in May 1965 the Consumer Price Index stood at 109.6 of its 1957-59 base, which was an increase of 0.3 percent for the month of May. If the rate of increase for April and May is maintained for the next 12 months, the Consumer Price Index would rise 3.6 percent, which is inflation in anybody's book. Even more important, the Wholesale Price Index rose by 2.0 percent from May 1964 to May 1965 and this index had been standing still from 1957 to 1964. We note that a number of recent labor contracts have provided about 4 percent in yearly wage increases, substantially above the guide lines set by the administration. These may well lead to cost-of-living increases during 1965 and future years.

We are entering the sixth fiscal year of continuous deficits. They have averaged over \$6 billion a year for the past 5 fiscal years. The deficit for fiscal 1965 is somewhat below \$4 billion, and this is being hailed as a great accomplishment. We deplore the doctrine of "permanent fiscal irresponsibility" coupled with a politically pressured easy money policy. The continuous use of fiscal "pep pills" has serious consequences—inflationary pressures (so hurtful to the very poor and the elderly retired), a growing interest charge on the public debt, and disruption of international trade as more and more nations lose their faith in the value of our currency. Even more important, Democrats in Congress have lit the fuse on an inflationary "time bomb" by rubber-stamping one expenditure program after another. These extended programs give the administration greater and greater carryover authority to spend and spend—in fact, this carryover unspent authorization ties the hands of Congress in switching to an anti-inflationary policy.

There are definite signs that the quality of much of the debt has been deteriorating and that its quantity may be growing too fast. The so-called temporary public debt ceiling was just raised from \$324 to \$328 billion. Other debt—of States, local governments, corporations, and individuals—has been growing more rapidly. For example, consumer installment payments now stand at 15 percent of personal income, and total debt of the average family is a staggering 60 percent of its yearly earnings. Bank credit has been expanding more quickly than in all previous expansions, although some recent changes are apparent here.

It is our view that the administration may be in great danger of falling from their tightrope. Clearly they are falling off on the side of inflation. It is our view that a balanced economy is important to all. We therefore endorse the suggestion made by Senator Javits and Congressman Curtis, i.e., that the Joint Economic Committee call hearings "at the earliest possible time" in order to explore "the basic issues raised by Mr. Martin" and "the outlook for the economy over the next year."

EDUCATION

September 9, 1965

By Representative Gerald R. Ford

The 89th Congress has passed several bills increasing the flow of Federal funds available for education. It has added a cut in excise taxes to a reduction of income tax rates in 1964.

Because of administration opposition, the Congress has not, however, provided tax relief specifically directed toward lightening the burden of higher education.

More than 5 million students will settle on the campuses of colleges and universities throughout the United States this month. In the course of the next 5 years, college enrollment is expected to increase by an additional 1½ million students.

The average cost of a year of higher education at a public institution is now \$1,560; it is \$2,370 at a private institution. These costs will continue to rise in future years. It is estimated that tuition charges will increase by 50 percent in both public and private institutions in the next decade.

The cost of going to college is a severe strain on the resources of most of the 5 million students now enrolled and on their families. Millions, who on the basis of ability deserve a college education, are deprived of one because of the financial burden.

The Higher Education Act of 1965 will provide Federal scholarships for fewer than 3 percent of the college students immediately and for fewer than 8 percent eventually. It will make borrowing to defray educational expenses somewhat easier, but these provisions are not enough.

The most effective and direct method of lightening the burden of college expenses for all is to provide for a credit which those who are paying for higher education may take against their Federal income tax.

Assistance of this kind has been advocated by Republicans for many years. We shall continue to fight for it.

EIGHTY-NINTH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, A COMMENTARY

October 23, 1965

By Senator Dirksen

The White House acted wisely in suppressing the motion picture which it had prepared glorifying the 89th Congress. For this session of the Congress would win no Oscar, even in the best supporting role category. From this Congress, we have had an echo, not a choice.

A movie of the 89th Congress would be like an episode of the old-time serial which always ended as the heroine was pushed off a cliff or was about to be ground up by an oncoming locomotive. Not until you see the thrilling episode that will be presented in this theater next year will you know whether 14(b) of Taft-Hartley is ground to bits under the administration's locomotive or whether the reapportionment amendment survives its fall from the cliff.

We would caution those who judge the work of the session which just wheezed to a close to look, not at the quantity of the legislative product, but at its quality. The test should be not how much has the Congress done, but how well has it done.

Always a candid man, the majority leader of the Senate has confessed serious deficiencies in the legislation enacted this year. Senator Mansfield has announced that the 2d session of the 89th Congress should "spend less time on new legislation and more time correcting oversights in legislation we have just passed." He has said the Congress "must tighten up the hasty enactments" and must rectify "a number of gaps and any number of rough edges, overextensions and overlaps."

It is highly significant that Senator Mansfield, in reviewing the work of this session before the Democratic Conference, could find no adjective to describe it other than the ambiguous word "exceptional."

As a believer in complete candor, I endorse the majority leader's appraisal of the work of this session. I assure him that he will find on the Republican side willing allies in the effort to devote considerable attention during the second session of this Congress to correction of the mistakes of the first session.

October 23, 1965

By Representative Gerald R. Ford

The 1st session of the 89th Congress clearly demonstrates the evils of one-party dominance of the national government.

When the party that occupies the White House holds a two-to-one majority in the Congress, the Congress ceases to function as a co-equal branch of government, the integrity of State and local governments is undermined, and the public interest is often jeopardized.

The executive branch unchecked becomes careless and arrogant. "Arrogant" is a strong word, but there is no other to describe those who attempted to bull through the appointment to the Federal judiciary of a man totally devoid of qualifications for this high office. There is no other word for the conduct of an agency that withholds Federal funds from a city in defiance of the procedures clearly established by Congress before such action can be taken. There is no other word for the methods used to rush legislation through the Congress without adequate consideration and without adequate opportunity to debate and to amend.

The House had no chance, for example, to consider any meaningful amendment to the bill repealing section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. In the consideration of the administration bill on elementary and secondary education, no opportunity was granted to the sponsors of 14 amendments for explanation and debate.

Protest has been heard from both sides of the aisle. Democratic Congresswoman Green, of Oregon, early in the session, condemned the "determined effort to silence those who are in disagreement." Many other Democrats have spoken out in similar terms in frustration and futility.

When either House of the Congress acts in this way, it abdicates its responsibility. It ceases to be a deliberative body and becomes a rubber-stamp.

State and local governments have suffered because of one-party dominance in this Congress. Congress has enacted far-reaching programs without concern for the views of responsible State and local officials or the effect of Federal action on existing State and local

programs. Especially significant was the Democratic attempt to deprive Governors of any shred of veto power over projects under the poverty program.

Finally, this Congress has been prodigal with taxpayers' money, over and above the military needs of the country. During this year \$119 billion has been appropriated—\$36 billion more than in the last year of the Eisenhower administration. For many new programs this year's appropriation is only a small fraction of the annual expenditure that will be inevitable when the programs are fully in operation.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS, THE CONDUCT OF

July 15, 1965

By Senator Dirksen

This is an appropriate time to speak of bipartisanship in foreign policy.

Bipartisanship signifies united support by the two major parties for such policy aims and means as are required for the security of the Nation.

A bipartisan foreign policy imposes obligations on both the majority and the minority parties. For the majority party, it counsels frequent consultation with the minority as policy is formulated and access for the minority to information needed to determine the wisdom of policy.

For the minority party it imposes an obligation to avoid carping about trivia. The minority should avoid the hypocrisy of complaining about measures which it would favor if it were in the position of policymaker. No administration should be blamed for events beyond its control.

Members of both parties must weigh all the consequences of public criticism. There is an obligation to demonstrate to both friend and foe that the American people are united in time of danger. There is an obligation to avoid furnishing grist for the propaganda mills of an enemy.

But bipartisan foreign policy has never meant a cessation of debate, of criticism, of suggestion. Senator Arthur Vandenberg, who, more than any other public figure in his time, personified bipartisanship, said that bipartisan foreign policy "simply seeks national security ahead of partisan advantage." But, he added immediately, "Every foreign policy must be totally debated * * * and the 'loyal opposition' is under special obligation to see that this occurs."

Debate, then, should be encouraged. Only in the crucible of full and candid debate can the Nation forge a foreign policy which will lead to the ends which all Americans seek to attain—peace, freedom, and security. Only thus can public understanding and acceptance of foreign policy be achieved.

Bipartisanship in foreign policy demands that representatives of both parties give each other a respectful hearing, that both deal in facts, that both discuss genuine issues, that both avoid distortion and misrepresentation.

We pray that the national security decisions of the President may always be wise. If we must disagree with any of those decisions, we

shall never question his sincere desire for peace. We expect that responsible spokesmen for his party will credit us with similar motives.

"GREAT SOCIETY"

March 18, 1965

By Representative Gerald R. Ford

In a series of messages to Congress that are almost encyclopedic in the listing of problems purportedly to be solved by the Federal Government, President Johnson proposes enactment of laws and the appropriation of funds that will place the Federal foot in the door of every important function now reserved to the States and local communities.

The formula is ingenious. The future needs of every local community for the next 10 to 20 years are fed, computer-like, into the Federal maw to arrive at a gigantic nationwide figure calculated to stagger the imagination and reduce the citizen to a feeling of utter helplessness. The heroic answer is of course the one now being set forth almost daily by the Johnson administration: Only the Federal Government can handle the problem.

Had our Founding Fathers examined the problems confronting them on the same basis, this country probably would have remained a British colony with the Crown handling everything. The fact that the States and local communities have been meeting these problems in their relatively simple locales for nearly two centuries of unequalled progress is ignored.

Federalized schools, textbooks, and teachers; federalized zoning building codes, health centers, and transportation; federalized libraries, laboratories, auditoriums and theaters—all these and much more are now in prospect for our States and local communities. In time our State and local governments can only be reduced to resident agents for the huge central authority in Washington.

Perhaps the American people want to abandon a proven system that has worked as no other on earth. We do not believe it. The Johnson program has been so disguised by platitudes and Madison Avenue adjectives that its real aim has not been recognized. We are told we are approaching the "Great Society."

We deem it our obligation to provide our citizens with full knowledge of the direction in which their Federal administration is heading our Nation. The end of this road is complete Federal control.

March 18, 1965

By Senator Dirksen

The unveiling of President Johnson's "Great Society" makes it starkly clear that the Federal Government has only begun to grow in size, power, and cost.

The central thesis of the "Great Society" is that bigger and bigger government means better and better health, better and better education, better and better transportation, and better and better environment. It resembles political "perpetual motion."

How big is Big Government today? The answer is: It's enormous.

Here are some samples of the combined impact of Federal, State and local governments: Taxes and other Government levies now consume 35 percent of total national income. One out of every six workers in the United States is a Government employee. One out of every five dollars spent in the United States for goods and services is spent by Government. One dollar out of every four dollars and a half of personal income in the United States is accounted for by direct Government payments.

The impact of the Federal Government alone is startling: Federal aid to State and local governments has risen from \$3.8 billion in 1956 to \$13.6 billion for 1966—an increase of nearly 260 percent. Federal funds now amount to 14 percent of total State-local revenue.

These figures give some idea of the size of Government today. Right now the Federal Government has more civilian employees in 30 of the 50 States than do State governments themselves, including the 5 biggest in the Union—California, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Ohio.

To all this we are now going to add President Johnson's "Great Society." There is no conceivable way to estimate its future cost. The sky's the limit.

The President has already told us that balancing the budget "too quickly" can be "self-defeating." Thus the Congress and the Nation have been put on notice that the "Great Society" will be financed by ever-increasing Federal deficits and, although not predicted by the President, these deficits could break all records, wartime or peacetime, if the "Great Society" expands as projected. It is time all Americans took a look at the hard facts.

LATIN AMERICA

May 20, 1965

By Senator Dirksen

From the time the President announced to congressional leaders that he had sent forces into the Dominican Republic to protect lives and to thwart the danger of a Communist takeover in that country, the Republicans in the Congress have given him their support.

Support of the President's action in the circumstances does not, however, imply blanket approval of administration policy toward Latin America.

The administration has been slow to recognize danger signals in Latin America. It has permitted problems to grow to crisis proportions before acting. It has been reluctant to provide leadership to make the Organization of American States an effective agency for the defense and development of the Western Hemisphere.

Even now, in its reaction to events in the Dominican Republic, the administration is not manifesting awareness of the extent and the danger of Castro-exported Communist subversion in at least half a dozen other American nations. In the past 3 years, many thousand citizens of other Latin American countries have received paramilitary and ideological training in Cuba and have been sent home to carry on subversion, terrorism, and guerrilla warfare in Central and South America. Since the end of November 1964, there has been renewed emphasis by Cuba on the use of violence to attain political power.

particularly in Venezuela, Colombia, and Guatemala. In Guatemala, the activities of 500 terrorists and guerrillas led to the establishment of a state of siege in February of this year. Haiti, Panama, Paraguay, El Salvador, and Honduras are all announced targets of Communist violence.

It is regrettable that the administration did not move to head off the new outbreak of subversion and violence when it was planned at the Havana meeting of Latin American Communist leaders in November 1964.

Clearly there is need now for vigorous and effective action by the Organization of American States and by the individual American nations to put an end to the current Castro offensive.

We urge the administration to present such a plan of action to the OAS before the tragic drama of the Dominican Republic is replayed in other Latin American nations.

"PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE"

March 4, 1965

By Senator Dirksen

In days past, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership have expressed support for a stiffened American military position in South Vietnam. At the very time we spoke, the Soviet and Red Chinese regimes were warning the United States against such action and promising the North Vietnamese increased military assistance. In many nations throughout the world, Communist agents were organizing riots and demonstrations against American diplomatic establishments in an all-out propaganda drive against the United States.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk has stated, as American policy, that there can be no negotiations on the Vietnamese issue so long as the Communist nations promote aggression against South Vietnam. We believe this a worthy policy. In fact, we advocated it.

We suggest that logic would have the United States carry this policy one step farther.

The Soviet Union has been espousing a policy of "peaceful co-existence." This policy was welcomed by the Kennedy and Johnson administrations and numerous moves were made to demonstrate American readiness to respond, particularly in the fields of trade, communications, and diplomatic relations.

Yet the fact remains that the Soviet Union and the other Communist nations have not diminished, but stepped up, their promotion of subversion in the neutral and free world countries. South Vietnam is only the most glaring example. The continued supplying of Cuba, the subversion in South America, notably Venezuela, and in Africa, notably the Congo, and the ceaseless agitation throughout southeast Asia, are typical.

The only thing peaceful about "peaceful co-existence" is the title. In any relaxed relations, it is the United States that is supposed to do the relaxing. The Communist nations continuously outrage the rights of other nations. Too long have we heard the trumpet of retreat from those who seem to favor another Munich.

If we are not going to negotiate the Vietnamese question until the aggression against South Vietnam ceases, an equally necessary

step would be to stop entertaining the overtures of the Communist nations for broader trade and diplomatic relations and to intensify our efforts to persuade our friends abroad to do the same, until the Communists have demonstrated their good faith in areas where not only freedom but life and death are at stake.

March 4, 1965

By Representative Gerald R. Ford

During the past 3 years the Soviet Union and other Communist nations have, under the so-called "peaceful co-existence" policy, made measurable gains in trade and diplomatic concessions from the United States while offering little in return. Here are some examples:

An agreement has been initiated for the establishment of a New York-Moscow air route which the Soviet Union has long sought.

An American-Soviet treaty has been negotiated, which now awaits Senate approval, that would give the Soviets consular offices they want in New York, Chicago, and San Francisco in exchange for similar American consulates in Russia which would avail us little and only give the Communists more targets for mob violence.

Having purchased \$140 million worth of badly needed U.S. wheat on which the American taxpayer paid \$44 million in subsidies so the Soviets could buy it for below our domestic price, Russia has now bought \$11 million in soybeans which the New York Times speculated might be going to Cuba.

In response to Communist bloc overtures for expanded trade, President Johnson has named a committee to explore stepped-up sales, and the Commerce Department's issuance of export licenses for sales to Communist nations has been increasing steadily.

Even more significant, our Government last month backed down completely on its widely publicized call for the Soviet Union to pay up its assessments to the United Nations, and then compounded this loss of face by lifting a 3-month freeze on voluntary contributions to the U.N. out of the U.S. Treasury.

From a standpoint of bargaining, we constantly give much and get little or nothing in deals with the Communist nations. We, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, urge a "no concession, no deal" policy, meaning that the Communists must be ready to make concessions as the price of agreements with the United States. Until we and our allies arrive at such a policy, we can only expect more Koreas and Vietnams and an ever-widening circle of Communist subversion around the earth.

POVERTY

September 30, 1965

By Senator Dirksen

Republicans have long been engaged in a determined and effective campaign to broaden economic opportunity for all Americans and to reduce the numbers of those in the lowest income brackets.

During the first 4 years of the Eisenhower administration the number of families below the \$3,000 income level (in dollars of constant purchasing power at 1962 prices) was reduced at a rate of 400,000 a

year. In 4 years since 1960, the number has been dropping at a rate of 250,000 a year.

When President Eisenhower assumed office, 28 percent of the families of the United States had incomes below \$3,000. Four years later the percentage was down 5 points to 23 percent. In 4 years of the Democratic administrations which succeeded Eisenhower, the figure has been reduced by 3 percentage points.

Despite the pressagentry of the current war on poverty, progress toward the goal of eliminating this evil has been slower during the past 4 years than it was during the first term of the last Republican administration.

The success of the administration's antipoverty efforts must be judged in these terms. The crucial question is whether these efforts with their vast increase in Federal spending and their sizable bureaucracy accelerate the rate of reduction of the numbers of those in the lowest income brackets. This question has become obscured in a paper blizzard of press releases from the White House and the Office of Economic Opportunity which provide some measurement of the effort of the administration but yield little information about the results.

The public is told how many communities there are in which Federal antipoverty programs have been started, how many Job Corps camps have been established, how many VISTA workers have been recruited, but it is not told how many poor people have increased their income, and by what amounts, because of participation in the antipoverty program. It is not even told the names of the disadvantaged youths who were given summer employment by the Post Office Department.

It is too early to pass final judgment on the effectiveness of the anti-poverty program. The evidence available at present makes it appear that the program has not yet proved itself.

September 30, 1965

By Representative Gerald R. Ford

There are several glaring weaknesses in the antipoverty program.

The administration of the program is chaotic. It is headed by a part-time Director and a top staff of temporary personnel who simultaneously decided to desert as the first skirmishes of the war on poverty were hardly underway. The Office of Economic Opportunity is top heavy with high salaried executives. In this agency, one out of every 18 employees receives a salary in excess of \$19,000. In the Defense Department, by contrast, one of 1,000 employees is paid more than \$19,000.

The program as administered treats elected State and local officials with cavalier disdain. Though Republican protest in the Congress salvaged some semblance of influence in the operation of the program for State Governors, neither State nor local officials have an effective voice in the program today. This weakening of the Federal system, on top of other centralizing programs of the current administration, is a dangerous trend.

Disregard of State and local governments and their elected officials has made the term "war" an apt title for the poverty program. In too many places it has become a war waged by local officials and competing

private groups with each other for control of Federal funds and for partisan and personal advantage. The poor are treated as the spoils in this conflict. They do not participate in decisions on what is to be done for them or to them.

Enough evidence has come to light to raise serious doubts about the Job Corps program. Instances of criminal and immoral behavior suggest inadequate selection processes for trainees and a breakdown of discipline. There is a serious question, too, as to whether the training consists too much of work that keeps youth off the streets but does not nurture skills needed in the job market.

The poverty program needs basic reform and a tightening of administrative practices. Whatever benefits that can be realized from this program can be attained less wastefully by clearer definition of objectives, by more careful structuring of programs, by cooperation with State and local governments, and by elimination of considerations of partisan political advantage.

REAPPORTIONMENT

July 22, 1965

By Senator Dirksen

A strange thing happened to the proposed constitutional amendment on apportionment of State legislatures on its way to the Senate floor. Disputes over the wording of the amendment have recently arisen and produced a deadlock in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

I am confident that the Senate will in time act favorably on an amendment. Recent discussion shows the need for clarification of the effect of the proposal.

There is universal recognition of the need for reform of the system of representation obtaining in most States at the time of several well-known Supreme Court decisions. In fact, in 1955 a presidential commission reported to President Eisenhower that the strengthening of State governments called for adequate representation of the interest of urban areas in State legislative bodies. I welcome the reforms now underway in many States in the belief that they provide more equitable representation and help to invigorate State governments. I do not, on the other hand, conclude that mechanical adherence to the "one man, one vote" principle should be imposed on both branches of the legislature of every State by Federal fiat regardless of the desires of the people. Everyone concedes that it is appropriate to require that representation in one house of the legislature of each State be based solely on the factor of population.

The proposed amendment does no more than permit the people of each State to employ factors other than population as the basis of representation in the other house if by periodic referendum a majority of the people in any State so desire.

It would not deny any minority group the opportunity to gain representation. Presumably any system of representation contrived to discriminate against any group would be struck down by the courts as a violation of the 14th amendment.

Experience shows that the "one man, one vote" principle can be used to euvre minorities out of seats in legislative bodies. This can be accomplished by submerging minorities in large constituencies

with at-large elections, as has been done in the State of Virginia to render less likely the election of members of minority groups to the State legislature. It can be accomplished by drawing district lines so as to spread the minority population thinly over a number of districts.

The issue which the proposed amendment presents is this: Shall we allow the people to make the decision about the basis of representation in one house of their State legislature, or shall we impose a decision on them whether they want it or not? We propose to meet this issue and fight every step of the way to preserve our Federal-State system and the historic right of the people of the several States to determine the composition of one branch of their own legislature according to their desires.

REPUBLICAN COORDINATING COMMITTEE

January 11, 1965

By Senator Dirksen

When defeat comes to a major political party in this country invariably there are outcries for revolutionary changes in party structure, party leadership and party policies. The Republican defeat of 1964 has produced these manifestations of uncertainty, unrest and uneasiness. Many suggestions, both formal and informal, for action pour from numerous sources.

We, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, are fully cognizant of the situation. There is no doubt in our minds that action is indicated and we are taking it. In our conversations since the November defeat we have discussed, among ourselves and with other recognized party leaders, numerous paths that might be followed. Always, certain basic facts have emerged:

First, that the only elected Republican officials of the Federal Establishment are the 32 Republican Members of the United States Senate and the 140 Members of the House of Representatives. Obviously and beyond dispute, they will guide Republican Party policy at the national level, in the absence of a Republican President and Vice President, by the record they write in the Congress. It is their responsibility.

Second, that an additional repository of advice and counsel on party policy exists in former Presidents and nominees for President, in our present elected Governors, in the members of the Republican National Committee and the State chairmen of our several States, and of course, in active Republican advocates at all other levels of the party structure. Their wisdom must be channeled into party policy formulation.

In the conviction that the Republican Party for a century has been and is an essential element in this nation's forward progress, and with the firm belief that all Republicans must join the effort, we, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, have on this day initiated a proposed mechanism to achieve a broad consensus on vital objectives for our country and our party. It is an honor to introduce my colleague, the new Republican Leader of the House, Jerry Ford, to provide the details of the proposal.

January 11, 1955

By Representative Gerald R. Ford

We propose to give the Republican Party a unified leadership. We are inviting the five living Republican nominees for President—one of whom, Dwight D. Eisenhower, served two terms in that office—and representatives of the Republican Governors Association to join with us in the establishment of a Republican Coordinating Committee to continuously examine party policy and party operations.

We have asked the Presiding Officer of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, the Republican National Chairman, Mr. Dean Burch, to serve as Presiding and Administrative Officer of the new Republican Coordinating Committee, and through the Republican National Committee to provide such staff assistance and funds as may be necessary. As Mr. Burch, himself, suggested, we regard this role an implicit responsibility for him or whoever may occupy his office in the future.

It will be the function of the Republican Coordinating Committee, composed of the eleven members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, the five living Republican nominees for President, and five representatives of the Republican Governors Association to facilitate the broadest party representation and the establishment of task forces for the study and examination of major national problems and issues.

For the Joint Leadership, I have been asked to add these two pertinent points: First, the Republican National Chairman has been requested to immediately invite the other participants to join us in forming the Republican Coordinating Committee. Second, we are convinced that the Republican Party is not only a great force in the American way of life, but it is the only living political instrument which can make the American Dream a reality, not a mere collection of words and promises. Our only goal is results and we intend to achieve them.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON GOP COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Q. Does the establishment of the Republican Coordinating Committee mean that the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership is surrendering its role as a policymaking body?

A. No, policy formulation, when the Party does not occupy the White House, still resides in Republican members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives and their elected leaders, but the Coordinating Committee will provide a communications center for the exchange of ideas on policy with other important party leaders and elected officials; also the establishment of task forces will be an implementing feature.

Q. Who will appoint the task forces?

A. The Republican National Chairman as the Presiding Officer of the Coordinating Committee will appoint the task forces with the advice of the Joint Leadership and, when appropriate, in consultation with the former Presidential nominees and representatives of the Governors Association. In all cases the Presiding Officer will circulate his lists of task force appointees in advance to all the participating members of the Coordinating Committee.

Q. Who will direct the staff operation which will assist both the Coordinating Committee and the task forces?

A. The Presiding Officer will designate a Staff Coordinator, presumably from the staff of the Republican National Committee. It will be the Staff Coordinator's responsibility to assemble volunteer research help.

Q. What about representation on the task forces for organized groups representing agriculture, labor, veterans, etc., etc.?

A. It is the hope of the Coordinating Committee the task forces will have help from all the major organizations in our society and such help will be sought.

Q. How often will the Coordinating Committee meet and when will the first meeting be?

A. The date of the first meeting will be fixed to suit the convenience of the maximum number of the Committee's members. This will be explored by the Presiding Officer. The continuity of Committee meetings will be established at the first session.

Q. How will the Coordinating Committee be financed?

A. By the Republican National Committee.

Q. Has this type of committee ever been set up before?

A. As near as can be determined neither major political party has ever attempted to establish a coordinating body such as the Republican Coordinating Committee. It is an innovation.

TAFT-HARTLEY 14(b)

July 22, 1965

By Representative Gerald R. Ford

Next week the Members of the House of Representatives will demonstrate by their votes whether they are members of an independent branch of government or simply yes men responding blindly to the manipulation of the executive branch.

The issue which the House will face is fair consideration of the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act—a section which simply preserves to each State some right to regulate labor-management relations.

An attempt will be made as a part of President Johnson's program to force repeal of section 14(b) through the House under the most stringent of gag rules. I anticipate a proposal that the House act on this important change of policy with only 2 hours of debate and that no opportunity be given to offer meaningful amendments.

If the House is not to sacrifice its self-respect, it will vote down the proposal that it shut its mouth, plug its ears, close its eyes, and swallow the Johnson administration's prescription without adequate debate and without opportunity to vote on important amendments.

The action expected next week is the latest manifestation of a disturbing tendency to avoid discussion of the subject of the repeal of section 14(b) on its merits. The administration has engaged in a cynical type of logrolling on the subject. It has sought to convince city Congressmen to vote for a bread tax against their convictions in order to get repeal of section 14(b) and farm Congressmen to vote for repeal of 14(b) against their convictions in order to get a farm bill.

If the coalition which the administration is ruthlessly trying to put together is successful, how can Congress be considered to act as an independent branch of government?

September 9, 1965.

By Senator Dirksen

If the President insists on Senate consideration of the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act this year, the present session of Congress will end not with a bang in the fall but with a whimper when the snow falls. Section 14(b) is the provision affirming the right of the States to forbid compulsory unionism.

The Senate will not act speedily on this issue so basic to Federal-State relations. Several Senators have promised extended discussion of the subject, and clearly the votes for cloture will not be forthcoming.

The Congress has done enough for 1965. There is no emergency, no crisis that requires immediate alteration of a law for which the President once voted and which he never sought to amend in the course of his 12 years of service in the Senate.

Undoubtedly there is room for many improvements in labor's relations with management and management's relations with labor. If the repeal of section 14(b) is taken up, it is clear that Members of the Senate cannot be persuaded to refrain from offering numerous and far-reaching changes in labor-management legislation. It would be far wiser for the Senate to turn to the task of overhauling such laws next year after a respite from the hectic pace of the present session and after consulting the folks back home than to attempt to ram through a single highly controversial change this year.

There are dangers in the indiscriminate use of presidential power to compel action from a reluctant Congress—particularly when the President showed little interest in the legislation until relatively late in the session.

UNEMPLOYMENT

August 5, 1965

By Representative Gerald R. Ford

It is now more than 4 years since the Council on Economic Advisers set an unemployment level of 4 percent as the "interim goal" of the administration. It is now more than 3 years since Hubert Humphrey declared, "I predict that by the end of the coming calendar year—by December 31, 1962, the problem of unemployment in the United States will be a page in the history book. * * *". The year 1962 is long gone. It has been a long interim, and the achievement of the goal is not yet in sight. The unemployment rate has been stuck around the 5 percent level since early in 1964.

In the four years since 1960 employment in agriculture has declined by 1 million jobs, or 17 percent. This is more than double the rate of decrease in farm jobs under the previous administration.

In spite of the economic upsurge which the Nation has experienced, unemployment remains an unsolved problem. Unlike past periods of upswing in economic activity, the current prosperity has not brought with it an automatic reduction of the ranks of the jobless to tolerable levels.

The problem of unemployment is particularly a problem of the young. The rate of joblessness among teenagers hovered between 15 and 17 percent before schools closed for the summer—a rate more than three times as high as that for the total working force.

Employment of youth promises to be a more difficult problem within the next few years because of substantial increases in the number entering the labor force. In 1964, 2,700,000 Americans reached their 18th birthday. This year 3,700,000 will reach the age of 18, and on through the 1970's approximately 4 million will attain this age each year.

Spending programs by the score have been offered as panaceas for unemployment. They have not attained the administration's stated goal.

We see here a repetition of lessons which should have been learned decades ago. A "Niagara" of Federal spending—a host of Federal programs—has never provided a real solution to the problem of unemployment.

The administration stands indicted by its obvious failure in dealing with this critical problem.

UNITED NATIONS

June 24, 1965

By Senator Dirksen

It is now clear that the United States has lost its fight to keep Article 19 of the United Nations Charter alive. The fight was waged with neither skill nor vigor.

No sophistry can mask the fact that the United Nations has been weakened and that the present administration has suffered a serious defeat.

Article 19 prescribes the penalty of loss of voting rights in the General Assembly for any member nation in arrears by 2 years or more in the payment of its contributions to the United Nations.

A decision of the World Court in 1962, ratified overwhelmingly by the General Assembly, removed any doubt that the Soviet Union and some other nations are now subject to the penalty of Article 19.

The administration at first loudly announced its intention to insist on the application of Article 19. It even threatened to withhold its contributions for some U.N. activities if the Soviet Union failed to pay up.

Because of the issue raised by Article 19, the last session of the General Assembly was a tragic farce with no voting at all until February 18. In effect, the delinquent members of the United Nations deprived the nations that had lived up to their obligations (including the United States) of their right to vote.

On February 18, a vote was taken. The acquiescence of the representative of the United States in that action constituted an abandonment of the position which he had taken until that time. On that day the position of the administration was exposed as a bluff, and a staggering blow was dealt to the structure of the United Nations.

We regret the backdown of last February. Further action to make Article 19 a dead letter will further weaken the United Nations.

Until the nations that are in arrears in their payments to the United Nations manifest interest in preserving the international

organization by moving to make up their deficit, the United States should make no voluntary additional contribution. Once this Nation embarks on a policy of paying the debts of other countries to the United Nations, there will be no end to the process. It will help neither the world organization nor the cause of peace.

June 24, 1965

By Representative Gerald R. Ford

We salute the United Nations with a mixture of satisfaction and apprehension on the occasion of its 20th anniversary.

Republicans (notably the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg) helped to bring this organization into being. They have loyally supported its every effort to attain the noble goals set forth in its charter.

There is some encouragement in its accomplishments in keeping the peace in certain troubled areas and there is reason for satisfaction in its social, economic, and humanitarian activities.

Yet the United Nations today is in difficult straits. It is bankrupt. It has been used as nothing more than a propaganda forum by many nations. It has violated its charter. The General Assembly was unable to take a vote on any substantive issue in its last session.

The survival of the Organization as an effective agency is in doubt.

To save it, the United States and its other leading members must move to deal with its problems instead of permitting them to fester and grow.

One problem is posed by the separation of power and responsibility. A two-thirds majority of the 114 members of the General Assembly can be put together by nations representing 10 percent of the population of U.N. members and 5 percent of the contributions to the U.N. budget. Clearly, these small states cannot enforce big decisions, and situations can easily arise in which big states will be unwilling to follow the orders of smaller members.

Another problem is the relationship of the United Nations to regional organizations such as the Organization of American States. In the Dominican Republic representatives of the U.N. have in fact worked at cross purposes with the representatives of the inter-American organization.

Finally, there is the problem of finance. For more than 3 years, the U.N. has teetered on the brink of bankruptcy. At present it is \$108 million in the red.

The problems are formidable. Solving them calls for determined action on the part of the administration.

VIETNAM

February 17, 1965

By the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership

It is undoubtedly difficult for the Communist capitals of Moscow, Peiping, and Hanoi—where disagreement is not tolerated—to understand that because Americans may differ on means to assure the complete independence of South Vietnam, there is no difference among us on the objective.

We, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, want to make it clear we support President Johnson's recent order for strikes against Communist supply bases in North Vietnam. If we have any difference with the President in this respect, it is the belief these measures might have been used more frequently since the Bay of Tonkin decision last August and an even stronger policy formulated in the meantime.

These Communist-proclaimed "wars of liberation" are nothing more than a verbal cover for naked aggression. The Communists unmask this aggression when they "stage" mob demonstrations against American embassies as free world resistance to their terrorist tactics in an independent nation is stepped up.

We suggest that so long as there is Communist-promoted infiltration of South Vietnam in violation of the 1954 and 1962 Geneva agreements, there can be no negotiations on the Vietnamese question, and we urge the President to make this unmistakably clear to the world. Agreements can only fail when the Communists negotiate only for domination and we negotiate only for peace.

June 18, 1965

By Senator Dirksen

To date, the Republicans in the Congress have publicly supported the administration's policy toward South Vietnam in the belief that it was in harmony with that enunciated by the Congress in joint resolution.

That objective, as defined last August, was "assisting the peoples of southeast Asia to protect their freedom."

Now doubt is raised about this objective by recent remarks of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. In a speech, timed so as to make it appear that it had Presidential approval, Senator Fulbright and some other Democrats may wish to redefine the objective for which American troops are being committed to conflict in South Vietnam in ever-increasing numbers.

The Senator calls for a "negotiated settlement involving major concessions by both sides."

Any who talk of concessions by the United States have an obligation to specify the kinds of concessions which they are prepared to advocate. They have an obligation, too, to indicate the limits beyond which concessions cannot be made.

Senator Fulbright suggests the Geneva Agreements of 1954 "in all their specifications" as a basis for settling the conflict in South Vietnam. But this agreement, as Secretary Rusk acknowledged in 1962, contained a fatal flaw in providing veto power to the Communist member of the international commission established to supervise the execution of the terms of the Geneva settlement.

This mistake must be avoided in any future peace settlement. So must the mistake of establishing a coalition government with Communist participation for South Vietnam. Bitter experience should have taught us that such a coalition merely defers a Communist takeover.

To conclude an agreement with such provisions would violate the President's promise of April 7, 1965: "We will not withdraw under the cloak of a meaningless agreement."

We hope for negotiations among representatives of responsible sovereign governments which will both end the fighting in South Vietnam and preserve the independence of that nation. The United States cannot, without violating its word, settle for less. The meaningless Laotian settlement of 1962 should be a lesson to us at this time.

June 18, 1965

By Representative Gerald R. Ford

Of all the things that Senator Fulbright has had to say, none was more revealing than his criticism of the Eisenhower administration for "encouraging" the South Vietnamese Government to refuse to permit the holding of a nationwide election in Vietnam in 1956.

The refusal was amply justified if only because the kind of election envisaged by the Geneva Agreement of 1954—a free election—could not have been held. Anyone who thinks that a free election was possible in Communist North Vietnam knows little of how Communists operate and could have fallen into a Moscow-Peiping trap.

The criticism boils down to a complaint that the U.S. Government failed to exert pressure on the South Vietnamese to surrender to the Communists 9 years ago.

Such was not the policy then—and veiled suggestions that it be the policy today should be emphatically repudiated.

The United States could not agree today—any more than in 1956—to legitimatizing Communist control of all of Vietnam by the device of a Communist-style election.

The Eisenhower administration labored to build out of the chaos in South Vietnam a durable economy, a progressive social order, and military strength.

That it achieved a considerable measure of success was attested to by several of Senator Fulbright's colleagues.

In February of 1960, Senator Mansfield's subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reported:

By any measure, Vietnam has made great progress under President Ngo Dinh Diem in the improvement of internal security, in the creation of the forms and institutions of popularly responsible government where before few existed, and in the advancement of the welfare of the people of Vietnam.

Finally, a major policy paper, issued by the State Department in December 1961, stated flatly that—

The years 1956 to 1960 produced something close to an economic miracle in South Vietnam * * *. It is a report of progress over a few brief years equaled by few young countries.

Any attempt to equate overall conditions, including the U.S. military commitment, in South Vietnam in 1960 with conditions there today is a crude distortion of history.

July 15, 1965

By Representative Gerald R. Ford

Today the President is being called on to make fateful decisions. His efforts to end the fighting in Vietnam by negotiation have been spurned. President Johnson has now decided to increase substantially the commitment of American ground forces in the theater of conflict.

As the military commitment grows, the Nation must be clear about its objectives, its responsibilities, and the consequences in Vietnam. This objective can only be the establishment of conditions under which the people of South Vietnam can live in peace, freedom, and security.

The objective can be attained only when aggression from within or without is brought to a halt.

The establishment of a coalition government with Communist participation in control of South Vietnam is incompatible with this objective.

Evacuation of American troops under an agreement to be policed by a commission including a Communist member with veto power over commission decisions would be incompatible with this objective.

The desire of the Government and the people of the United States to negotiate a peace in Vietnam has been established beyond question. But a peace which would turn South Vietnam over to the Communists—immediately or after some interval—must be forthrightly rejected.

Any doubt as to the resoluteness of the United States in the pursuit of the objective of maintaining the freedom and independence of South Vietnam that has arisen is due to unfortunate statements of some Democrats.

Although we do not quarrel with the President in his invitation to the aggressors to negotiate without any preconditions, we doubt the wisdom of failing to make it clear that the United States is not going to agree to the kind of treaty and truce provisions that have made possible Communist takeovers in the past.

President Johnson has said that the United States will not withdraw from Vietnam under a meaningless agreement. We suggest that the President assure the Nation that no agreement will be made which will make a mockery of the sacrifices already suffered by our American fighting men and the soldiers of South Vietnam.