

A RECORD OF PRESS CONFERENCE
STATEMENTS

MADE BY

SENATOR EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

AND

REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD

FOR

THE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP
OF THE CONGRESS



PRESENTED BY MR. DIRKSEN

OCTOBER 14, 1966.—Ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

THE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP OF THE CONGRESS

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
THURSTON B. MORTON, Chairman of the Re-
publican Senatorial Committee

FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

GERALD R. FORD, Leader
LESLIE C. ARENDS, Whip
MELVIN B. LAIRD, Chairman of the Confer-
ence
JOHN J. RHODES, Chairman of the Policy Com-
mittee
H. ALLEN SMITH, Ranking Member, Rules
Committee
BOB WILSON, Chairman, Republican Congres-
sional Committee
CHARLES E. GOODELL, Chairman, Commis-
sion on Planning and Research

PARADE OFFICER

RAY C. BLISS, the Republican National Chairman

FOREWORD

This legislative year marks the sixth year of existence of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, now identified as the Republican Leadership of the Congress, established at the suggestion of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower in January of 1961.

As before, the format of communication from the leadership continues to be the issuance of policy statements on subjects of both foreign and domestic significance. These statements have, on 18 regular occasions since January, taken the form of press conference appearances by Senator Dirksen and Representative Ford. In addition, press releases have been issued separately from these conferences by the Leadership and, from time to time, by individual members of the Leadership.

As has been true of Leadership meetings, Republican National Committee Chairman Ray C. Bliss also presided over the quarterly meetings of the Republican Coordinating Committee, an assembly composed of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, former Republican presidential candidates Alf M. Landon, Richard M. Nixon, and Barry Goldwater, the Republican Leadership of the Congress, and representatives of multiple other Republican organizations.

During this past Congressional session the Coordinating Committee held 3 sessions, maintained 6 task forces and approved and published nationally 13 task force reports. The Republican Coordinating Committee continues as an increasingly positive force in the examination of party policies and party operations. Its proposals and task force recommendations represent strong and consistent evidence of Republican thought and action.

As in previous years, the Leadership statements for 1966 are being published as a Senate document. They appear on the following pages and are indexed as to the issue covered.

CONTENTS

	Page
Budget.....	1-2
Congress—The minority role.....	2-4
The Credibility Gap.....	4-6
Credibility—Public trust.....	6-8
The National Economy.....	9-10
Farm Prices.....	10-15
Foreign Aid.....	16-17
Foreign Policy—All Asian conference.....	18
Foreign Policy—Red trade.....	18-19
Foreign Policy—Vietnam.....	20
Inflation.....	21-26
Inflation—The costs of living.....	26-30
L.B.J.—Public confidence.....	30-32
Medicare.....	32
War on Poverty.....	33-35
Wage and Price Controls.....	36

A RECORD OF PRESS CONFERENCE STATEMENTS

BUDGET

March 10, 1966

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

The Johnson-Humphrey Administration has been less than fully candid with the American people and the Congress about its spending programs. Its budget explanations have been far from concise and clear.

For 3 years the budgets have been consistent in two matters—they have contained built-in deficits and they have failed to establish priorities.

During this time the war in Vietnam has escalated but there was little effort through the budget to set priorities for future needs. The result has been a multitude of sizable supplemental appropriations.

This year's budget is \$13 billion higher than the one submitted a year ago. The President says, however, it contains a deficit of "only" \$1.8 billion. What he has failed to tell the American people is that this small deficit is fiscal chicanery. He has cut from this budget some \$200 million in popular programs which he knows the Congress will undoubtedly restore. He has grossly understated the needs of the Defense Department for fiscal 1967. He also fails to mention that \$5.2 billion of his added revenue is a 1-year proposition only. The Government will gain in this 1 year \$1.6 billion from coin clipping by removing silver from our coinage and another \$3.6 billion from the speedup in tax collections.

In presenting his budget the President said that despite fighting in Vietnam the war on poverty must also be escalated. For this he asked an increase of \$300 million in antipoverty funds. And yet, on March 8, his antipoverty Director informed the Congress the poverty war is being curtailed because of the Vietnamese fighting.

The budgets with their yearly deficits have helped breed inflation and yet the Administration scoffs at inflation. With high taxes, high prices, high spending, high deficits—the Great Society has become the High Society.

It is time for the Johnson-Humphrey Administration to present precise, more realistic figure and candid budgetary estimates to the American people so that they may judge truly how much they are spending to meet the Administration's vast commitments here and abroad.

March 10, 1966

By Senator Dirksen:

The Johnson-Humphrey Administration has failed to reassure the American people and the Congress concerning inflation, the war in Vietnam, and its future tax programs.

Inflation is mounting at a rapid rate due in large part to fiscal and budgetary policies of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration. Prices vary from day to day but continue to move higher and higher. This affects not only the public but the purchase of goods and services by the Government as well.

The war in Vietnam is escalating but the Administration has not informed the American people how big it will get nor how costly it will become.

Excise tax cuts given by Congress a year ago are being rescinded at the request of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration. There is continued talk of new tax increases to come later this year.

Perhaps the most dangerous sign of a new Johnson-Humphrey power grab has been the floating of "trial balloons" on standby or emergency powers for the President to raise or lower taxes and perhaps impose direct wage and price controls at will.

Republicans take sharp issue with this proposal. The Congress should not further abdicate its constitutional taxing responsibility. Republicans are unalterably opposed to granting standby taxing powers or standby wage and price control authority to the President.

For these reasons, the Republican Leadership strongly endorses a resolution adopted by the Senate Republican Policy Committee on March 8. That resolution reads in part as follows:

Resolved, In view of the clear language of article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution we are unalterably opposed to granting to the President of the United States any standby, emergency, or other authority to raise or lower taxes.

CONGRESS—THE MINORITY ROLE

September 22, 1966

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

Mr. President, our Question-of the Week:

Can We Afford Your Automatic-Democratic Congress?

This may be, in some respects, a push-button world. It may be, in some respects, a computer civilization. It may be, here and there, that the rubber stamp has its proper place and function. But, the push-button, the computer and the rubber stamp wielded in the White House have not yet won the approval of the American people where their Representatives and Senators in the Congress are concerned.

Does the Johnson-Humphrey Administration want not only a blank check but push-button, computerized, rubber-stamp voting in the Senate and in the House? This the American people will no longer tolerate.

Proof positive of this Administration's push-button psychology is the voting record of those 45 freshman Democrats, elected in 1964 from districts formerly Republican, whose automatic responses to the wishes of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration are recorded for all to see.

Item: On reduction of foreign aid (authorization), 1965. This was defeated by 41 votes. 38 of these were automatic-Democratic freshman votes.

Item: On foreign aid authorization (recommittal), 1966. Recommittal failed by 2 votes. 36 of the automatic-Democratic freshmen voted against recommittal.

Item: On antipoverty program expansion (recommittal). Recommittal was defeated by 49 votes. 39 of these were automatic-Democratic freshman votes.

Item: On the repeal of 14(b)—the right to work. The bill passed by 18 votes. 41 votes for it were automatic-Democratic freshman votes.

Item: On rent subsidies (recommittal). The margin was eight votes. Thirty-six automatic-Democratic freshmen voted to keep this bill alive.

Says Fortune magazine (September 1966):

* * * those 45 provided the saving margin for a number of the more expansive and expensive Administration programs * * *

This automatic-Democratic response by new Members of the House was echoed by that of the rest of the top-heavy Democratic majority in the House. The push-button, the computer, the rubber-stamp wielded by the Johnson-Humphrey Administration were in full force in every instance. The result: a travesty on the legislative process, a gross disservice to the will and the wishes of the American people.

No free society can long survive dominance by an unthinking computer, nor dominance by an unthinking, unrestrained, top-heavy legislative majority. This Democratic Congress, with its 294 to 139 majority in the House and its 67 to 33 majority in the Senate, has lost its independence. It is the tool of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration. The Administration and this Democratic Congress must bear full and joint responsibility for the failures and the continuing problems we face. This fact cannot be contradicted. Its simple arithmetic cannot be argued.

In our great tradition, the will of the majority must prevail, yet the will of the minority must both be respected and remain vital if, as has invariably happened in world history, an overwhelming majority, seeking unreasoning power, is not to silence, subdue, and then suffocate the essential minority.

We cannot believe for a moment that the American people will any longer accept a push-button Congress or consensus by computer. We believe they agree increasingly that only in a healthy balance of numbers and opinions can this free land survive and prevail.

Therefore, Mr. President: Our Question of the Week:

Can we afford your automatic-Democratic Congress?

September 22, 1966

By Senator Dirksen:

Mr. President, our Question of the Week:

Can we Afford Your Automatic-Democratic Congress?

Seldom has the hypocrisy of numbers been better illustrated than in the voting during this past week on the civil rights bill. The Republican minority and its Leadership in the Senate have been indicated and damned by the Johnson-Humphrey Administration and its Democratic majority for having killed the civil rights bill. How, conceivably, can men of intelligence and good will so overlook that same simple arithmetic to which Mr. Ford has just made reference?

There are 67 Democrats in the Senate. There are 33 Republicans. This being so, how under heaven, can it be concluded that the Republicans defeated civil rights? Had the Johnson-Humphrey Administration truly wished it, had the Democrats in the Senate truly sought it, the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966 would, without doubt, at this very moment, be the law of the land. As one writer put it in comment on the classic question of "Who killed Cock Robin?" it had to be a Democratic arrow—not that of the Republican minority.

Happily for the Nation's best interest, fortunately for the freedom of the individual, the Republican minority, outnumbered as it was, reflected the will of our people to a degree that made converts of regular Democrats and resulted in a vote that assured the right of every American to preserve the integrity of his own judgment and to determine the future of his own home.

The will of the people in this instance prevailed, but it could never have done so if a determined minority had not made clear the issues involved and in so doing won the respect and the response of many others.

It is unwise, it is dangerous and it can be disastrous, when an overwhelming majority is permitted to prevail without question or hindrance. Only as a majority is repeatedly questioned and checked by a strong minority can the foundations of this Republic be preserved. That we, a present minority, would welcome majority status is undeniable, but until that inevitable day we believe it all-important to the American people that our numbers and our hand be strengthened sufficiently to outlaw forever from Capital Hill the push-button, the computer, the soulless rubber-stamp.

Therefore, Mr. President, our Question of the Week:

Can we afford your automatic-Democratic Congress?

THE CREDIBILITY GAP

March 31, 1966

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

There's no longer a "credibility gap"—it's become a credibility canyon—and it's widening between the Johnson-Humphrey Administration and the American people with every week that goes by.

Dateline, March 15, the New York Times:

Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler indicated today that he believed that there had been excessive alarm in business circles about the boom economy.

Dateline, March 23, the New York Times:

President Johnson, citing some decline in business indicators, made clear today that he was not yet convinced that a tax increase was needed to slow down economic expansion and inflation.

Dateline, March 24, the Baltimore Sun:

In a notable exhibition of Administration teamwork, Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury, today reiterated what President Johnson said late yesterday—there is no reason at the moment to ask for an anti-inflation tax increase.

And yesterday, March 30, following announcement of a 0.5-percent nationwide cost-of-living increase, the front pages of the press across the country reported that the President favors a 5- to 7-percent tax rise if one is needed. How do you spell "credibility"? What can we believe?

The Johnson-Humphrey Administration must take about \$5 billion annually out of the economy if inflation is to be checked and a recession prevented. It does not have the wish, nor the wit, nor the will to reduce expenditures, hence it must increase taxes.

The checking of inflation could be achieved, as Republicans have long maintained, by a reduction of wholly unwise Federal expenditures and by other essential fiscal, monetary, and economic reforms.

The Johnson-Humphrey Administration has elected the alternative of new taxes.

Dateline, March 30, the Wall Street Journal—"Consumers Boil About Widespread Increases; Many Attempt a Revolt." Whom can we best believe on the high and rising cost of living—America's homemakers and wage earners or a Democratic Administration that will not see, will not hear, and will not believe these frightening facts of economic life?

June 9, 1966

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

James Reston in the New York Times on May 17 last, wrote:

What he (L.B.J.) wants is worthy of the faith and confidence of the Nation, but this is precisely what he does not have, because his techniques blur his conviction * * *. He is mixing up news and truth * * *. He is confronted, in short, with a crisis of confidence * * *.

This statement expresses a point of view and a deep regret, both of which we fully share.

On May 25, 1966, 19 distinguished Republican members of the House of Representatives, including the entire leadership, cataloged and summarized on the floor of the House the detailed reasons why this crisis of confidence has resulted. We have seen this in almost every aspect of the domestic scene. It has been revealed in the

President's budget messages and management. It has appeared in the war on poverty. It has emerged relative to the NASA program. It was vivid in wage-price guidepost disputes with labor and with management. It was startling in his action on surplus sales of industrial stockpiles and farm products. It became bewildering in Federal job multiplication figures. It surfaced again in appointments to high level offices. It proved shocking in the President's uncertain assessment of the economy. In all these categories of confidence doubt has developed and the American people have, not at all surprisingly, steadily lost faith in a President who is rapidly losing touch with them. *A consensus of no confidence is coming to pass.*

Constructively, positively, let it be recorded here and now that the Republican opposition wants with all of its heart and energy to support the President of the United States when he is either right or of the right intent. In such cases it will always do so, but the Republicans in the Congress—and, indeed, the Democrats in Congress as well—cannot know what is right or of right intent in the President's policies unless they have the facts upon which to base their judgments. The facts are all too seldom given us by this Administration.

There are those in this Administration who appear to believe that half-a-truth is better than none. We disagree. Where the American people at home are concerned we must have the whole truth. Where the American people in their foreign interests and national security are concerned, we must be given every fact possible consistent with our safety. Given such facts as to domestic and foreign policy, we in Congress will, with all the people, be reassured that the soundest, the sanest, the best possible decisions will be made in the days to come.

As of this date, as the record so clearly proves, we have not been given and are not being given the vital facts of American life by the Johnson-Humphrey Administration. We do not charge the Administration with falsehood but we do claim it has failed to reveal the whole truth. This being so, this crisis of confidence is inevitable and the consequent danger to the American people is great.

Therefore, our Question of the Week:

Mr. President, What can we believe?

CREDIBILITY—PUBLIC TRUST

September 15, 1966

By Senator Dirksen:

Mr. President and Democratic Members of the Congress:

The American people are troubled, confused, and terribly uncertain as to the future. Their worry and their uncertainty have their basis in both the actions and the inaction of your Administration, to which they look hopefully for a leadership still sadly lacking.

The most recent of the nationwide surveys of public opinion confirms this fact, indicating clearly that in six vital areas of domestic concern—fiscal and monetary policy, civil rights, the war on poverty, the farm problem, the curbing of inflation, and labor-management relations—less than half of our people have been able to maintain their confidence in you over these many months.

On Thursday last you presented to the Congress and the people a five-point program hopefully designed to cool our Nation's growing

economic fever and to restore something of the promise a once healthy economy had.

Belatedly acknowledging as "a cruel and unjust tax on all the people" the inflation now raging throughout the country—inflation created in great part by your actions—you indicated, first, an intention to cut all Federal expenditures to the fullest extent possible. Inasmuch as this primary and fundamental brake on inflation was recommended to you by Republicans and documented in detail by us 9 months ago, why has this announcement of good intent been so long delayed? Specifically how—specifically where—and specifically when—will you order such budget cuts? Will you demand of your Democrat-controlled Congress that it take the action required on the eight appropriation bills still remaining before it? Will you slow down the multimillion dollar Great Society programs already in your hands? Will you, in short, act—now? Republicans stand ready, as always, to help in such actions.

Second, you recommended that the 7-percent investment tax credit be made temporarily inoperative. Could this have any possible effect on our inflated economy for at least another 6 months? Is your proposal a breach of good faith with the industrial, small business, and farm communities?

Third, you recommended suspension of the use of accelerated depreciation on structures started or transferred after September 1 of this year. Do you believe this a factor of consequence in limiting construction activity and costs? Upon what basis was this remarkable conclusion reached? Even if valid, how soon could it have any beneficial effect—if it had any at all?

Fourth, you urged the Federal Reserve Board to lower interest rates and so ease the tight money burden. How odd that your Administration and your Democrats in Congress, allegedly so devoted to low interest rates and loose money should for so long have made high interest rates inevitable by your reckless spending policies and programs.

Fifth, you urged deferment of certain Federal borrowing to alleviate credit pressures. Here again you have at long last but much too late endorsed a clear and firm Republican recommendation of many months ago. As a *New York Times* editorial put it last Tuesday, September 13:

Even more important, the decision is a sign that the administration may have finally realized that it cannot really be fiscally responsible so long as it indulges in financial gimmickry.

Why this delay, Mr. President? Why such uncertainty? Why such fear of the future?

This is exactly that uncertainty—that growing fear—that is spreading so rapidly among all our people. They are uncertain, they are bewildered as to the future—the future of the economy, the future of their jobs, the future of the Nation, the future of their children in every aspect of their lives.

Therefore, Mr. President and Democratic Members of the Congress, most sincerely and respectfully—

Our Question of the Week:

When will the trust and confidence of the people be restored?

September 15, 1966

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

Mr. President and Democratic Members of the Congress:

As these problems multiply at home—and abroad—and as the uncertainty among our people grows, we look to the weeks ahead with apprehension and understandably wonder what the future may hold.

As increasing reference is made to a possible adjournment of the Congress by mid-October, election day, November 8, draws closer and we wonder more and more what the immediate period thereafter may bring.

From time to time, for example, you and your Administration and you Democrats in Congress have suggested a tax increase as one of the means available for checking inflation. Mr. President, do you plan to recommend to your Democratic Congress an increase in our already heavy income taxes, *after November 8?*

Equally often, spokesmen for this Administration, including yourself, Mr. President, have made reference to wage-and-price controls as an alternative inflation check. Most recently, a Democratic Senate leader urged that authority for standby controls be given you. Do you have in mind the imposition of wage-and-price controls, *after November 8th?*

In an address to the American Farm Economics Association, a prominent official of your Administration by inference wrote off as uneconomical and needless more than 2 million of America's small farms and farmers. Is it contemplated that this farm elimination program shall be undertaken by your Democratic Congress, Mr. President, *after November 8th?*

The rumor persists with each passing day that the antipoverty program of your Administration, so loudly hailed and so extravagantly administered, is under survey by the Bureau of the Budget, at your order, as the first step toward its dismantlement. Is this, too, something planned for action by your Democratic Congress, Mr. President, *after November 8th?*

Your Secretary of the Treasury and your Secretary of Commerce, in testifying this week before the House Ways and Means Committee on certain of your proposals identified them as "an essential and enduring part of our tax structure." Earlier in the year, they said they were opposed to any "tinkering" with these credits for economic purposes. Yet now, apparently under pressure, they blandly endorse such "tinkering." Will this "tinkering" continue, *after November 8th?*

Our people cannot long endure such uncertainties. They cannot live nor work effectively without trust and confidence. Therefore, Mr. President and Democratic Members of the Congress, most respectfully and sincerely,

Our Question of the Week:

When will the trust and confidence of the people be restored?

THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

March 17, 1966

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

In its manpower report of last week the Johnson-Humphrey Administration offered a politically attractive but far from complete account of the national economy. The decline in unemployment to 3.7 percent was hailed as a milestone on the road to realization of our full economic potential.

All Americans are pleased that fewer of their countrymen are without jobs. We hope that every American seeking a job finds one at a decent, living wage. Most of all, however, we hope Americans can find full and continuing employment in a nation at peace.

A sober examination of figures this manpower report did not include, however, raises a cruelly serious question. Is this bright economic picture due to real prosperity as the Administration claims or is it, rather, due to the bloody facts of war in Vietnam?

The harshest fact is that during the past 12 months over 268,000 Americans were inducted into the Armed Forces. On the surface, one of the most heartening statistics concerns the sharp decline in unemployment among men under 25. The number of unemployed in this age group dropped by 190,000 in the past year. During this same period 264,757 men in this age group were inducted. Obviously, the total decline in unemployment in this group can be accounted for mainly by the draft. This would hardly appear a milestone on the road to national economic health.

Unemployment always declines during wartime. Without blushing, the manpower report states it has been more than 12 years since unemployment was lower than it is now. They chose to emphasize 1953 but failed to mention that the Korean war was still being fought then. They could have cited an even more dramatic figure—the 1.2 percent unemployment rate of 1944, when a global war was still being fought.

This is another glaring example of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration's political double standards. They are claiming credit for giving the American people prosperity and what they call record peacetime employment. In this they are playing cruelly cynical politics by disregarding the wartime boom and the wartime draft calls that contribute so significantly to their statistics.

March 17, 1966

By Senator Dirksen:

A new game has made its appearance in Washington, and the name of the game is "Statistics." To win, you have to be able to tell everybody everything they'd like to hear—and back it up with figures. Relevancy and accuracy of the figures are not important. The Johnson-Humphrey Administration plays the game of "Statistics" with consummate skill.

For instance, a new program is often justified by saying it will cost less than 1 percent of the gross national product, as though GNP were some vast kitty upon which we could draw to finance these programs. And Democratic Administration cohorts point with pride to a \$47.6 billion growth in the GNP for last year. Blissfully, they

ignore the fact that \$13.5 billion of this growth is due to price increases; in other words, inflation. Although of questionable accuracy, GNP is a useful tool in measuring national production of goods and services, but loses its meaning when used for political purposes.

And the Johnson-Humphrey Administration does conjure with GNP figures for political reasons. Every supposedly productive dollar transaction is dutifully tabulated. Notwithstanding the size of the GNP, every time the price of bread and milk goes up it's a bang in the paycheck. And, of course, GNP goes up, too. Every time rent goes up, it's a bang in the paycheck, and, of course, GNP goes up as well. What's really happening here is that when GNP goes up inflation is tearing off more of your paycheck.

Republicans have mentioned the Johnson-Humphrey sleight-of-hand budget. But how about the national debt? How much does the Nation actually owe? Congress and the public know about the \$323.7 billion statutory debt. But there are no accurate reports on the indirect debt, meaning debt commitments for which no funds have been made available. This includes the \$300 billion owed to the social security fund and the \$40 billion owed to the civil service retirement fund. It also includes \$420 billion in contingent liabilities. In all, they have not accounted for over \$1,000 billion—trillion to you—in such indirect debts. Republicans have repeatedly sought such an accounting without success. Twice bills demanding such reports have passed the Senate.

The game of fiscal and statistical hocus-pocus has become the rule of the day in Washington. The American people know blarney when they see it and know they cannot win.

FARM PRICES

June 16, 1966

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

On March 31 last, the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, announced that the prices of farm products had dropped during the preceding weeks and expressed delight in this fact. The press throughout the Nation reported his elation in detail and farmers throughout America reacted angrily.

The New York Times began its report on the situation in this way:

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman expressed pleasure today with the fact that the prices of farm products had dropped recently.

It was the first time in the memory of Federal farm officials that a Secretary of Agriculture indicated that he was pleased with a decrease in farm prices. Like Mr. Freeman, the officials were happy to note that consumers would benefit from lower prices by this summer.

Let me repeat that last sentence:

Like Mr. Freeman, the officials were happy to note that consumers would benefit from lower prices by this summer.

There is only one flaw in this statement. It simply isn't true. Paradoxically, as farm prices have moved steadily downward, retail food

prices have risen even more rapidly and the Department of Labor's cost-of-living index has continued to climb to record highs.

Secretary Freeman, Economic Adviser Gardner Ackley, and each of the other prominent agrocrats have tried, repeatedly and with zeal, to make the American farmer and his family the whipping boys for the inflation that is steadily taking more and more dollars from the pockets of every American. The housewives of America should be told that 61 percent of the cost of the food in their market baskets is added after it leaves the farm. I repeat—the housewives of America should be told that 61 percent of the cost of the food in their market baskets is added after it leaves the farm.

The cold, hard fact of the matter is that the rising costs of living in this country can be attributed primarily to the excessive, reckless spending of our people's money for wasteful, too often unnecessary programs conceived by the so-called Great Society planners and concurred in by the great majority of Democrats in Congress.

Secretary Freeman has alleged that during his tenure of office the American farmer has enjoyed a 50-percent increase in his income. Will all the farmers who have enjoyed a real income increase of 50 percent please stand up? Or, better yet, let the Administration and the Congress hear from you by letter, wire, or telephone. Farm organizations, farm state newspapers, farm leaders, and countless individual farmers from coast to coast are boiling with anger over the policies and practices of this Administration which are driving farm prices swiftly downward and consumer costs harshly upward with each passing day.

Let there be no mistake. The Johnson-Humphrey Administration is using and abusing American farmers and ranchers as the scapegoats of inflation. To this statement I attach a listing of specific examples and I invite your attention to it.

When the agrocrats of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration impose policies and practices which help no one and harm everyone, the Congress and the American people are fully justified in their anger. The boiling point is near at hand.

Therefore, our Question of the Week:

Mr. President, are you going to keep prices down on the farm?

The Johnson-Humphrey Administration is using and abusing American farmers and ranchers as the scapegoats of inflation:

(1) By domestic fiscal policies which have sharply increased farm production costs;

(2) By market price manipulations which have decreased prices received by farmers, with the result that the present parity ratio stands at only 79, even including direct subsidies, despite Democratic promises of 100;

(3) By refusing to admit that increased consumer prices—increased food costs to the housewife and the wage earner—have not been caused by farmers, such consumer prices having risen steadily as farm prices have as steadily decreased;

(4) By recommending drastic cuts in congressional appropriations for school milk, school lunches, land grant colleges, and other vital programs;

(5) By the Secretary of Agriculture's dumping of huge quantities of grain at unrealistic prices upon the domestic market in order to break and depress grain and livestock market prices;

(6) By the Department of Commerce action of March 7, 1966, imposing restriction on the export of cattle hides, calf and kip skins, such action resulting in lower domestic livestock products;

(7) By a large and unilateral increase in Cheddar cheese imports, without any attempt being made to secure reciprocal trade concessions from other nations to expand U.S. agricultural exports overseas;

(8) By a sharp curtailment of purchases of pork and of butter and other dairy products by the Department of Defense; and, I repeat—

(9) By the Secretary of Agriculture's expression of pleasure with the fact that prices of farm products have dropped.

June 16, 1966

By Senator Dirksen:

When farm prices go down and farm production costs rise—when the taxpayer's living costs rise and his dollar earnings decrease in value—the American people are experiencing what is known in some circles as the double whammy. The Johnson-Humphrey Administration's "double whammy" on this Nation is now past all endurance.

For the agricroats of this Administration to contend or even to imply that the price of farm products is a cause of inflation is ridiculous. The principal cause of the inflation now upon us throughout America is, rather, the wild, willful and witless spending of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration and its supporters in countless needless areas.

Inflation is on the move throughout the Nation. Should it become rampant—as it threatens to do—those who will suffer most will be those in the lowest income brackets. Make no misjudgements about this whatever.

Thus far, this administration's major attack upon rapidly rising living costs has been directed—wholly misdirected—against farm prices. Living costs cannot be reduced significantly by any such action, even though the Administration's economic advisers appear to think so. With farm prices down 13 percent and retail food prices up 16 percent between America's wars of 1951 in Korea and 1966 in Vietnam, it should be clear even to these agricroats that the real villain confronting them is the inflation so steadily promoted by their reckless spending for needless programs and not by the prices down on the farm.

Let it be recorded here and now that our vigorous protest against these policies is neither partisan nor improperly political.

We invite the attention of the Congress, the press, and the public to the several resolutions that have been filed from both sides of the aisle in a dedicated effort to meet this problem squarely—Senate Concurrent Resolution 93 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 88, among others—and we commend without reservation the fairminded determination of the Republican and Democratic Senators sponsoring them.

Meanwhile, down on the farm, the public anger to which we have referred is finding ever greater expression with each passing day—and we in the Congress are well aware of it. It has found voice

with particular force and eloquence in an editorial that first appeared in the Walsh County Record published at Grafton, N. Dak., on May 19 last, in which these two paragraphs seem to me especially pertinent:

Mr. President: This is either the fifth or sixth draft of this brief comment. The first, written in instantaneous anger a couple or weeks ago was, after overnight reflection, discarded as just too furious. In the intervening days, there's been a mighty struggle going on to temper our fury down to rage, and then to wrath, and then to indignation. That seems to be as far as the emotion can be distilled.

When you and your appointed aids announce that you are going to control inflation by making war on farm prices, you've set a grass fire, Mr. President. For the fact is, war is never waged against an abstraction, like prices. War is waged against people. In this case, us.

We repeat " * * * against people. In this case, us."

I suggest that we listen now to the men and the women who feed the Nation—taxpayers like all the rest of us. I suggest we stop listening to these agricroats in Washington, far removed from the farmlands and even further removed from reality.

Therefore, our Question of the Week:

Mr. President, are you going to keep prices down on the farm?

August 5, 1968

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

Democratic Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, met in Washington last week in a closed session with a number of Democratic candidates for reelection to Congress, to discuss Democratic tactics and techniques of the coming campaign.

A reporter from the Chicago Tribune was present and recorded that Democratic political discussion in detail. Among other things, he wrote:

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has told Democratic congressional candidates at a closed briefing that they must overcome deep resentment in farm areas and should stay away from discussion of inflation. * * *

A candidate from Columbus, Ohio, told Freeman that a poll in his district showed that the major issue was inflation and he sought advice on how to handle questions about the increased cost of living.

"I've been trying to figure out an answer to that question for 6 years," Freeman replied. "Slip, slide, and duck any question of higher consumer prices if you possibly can."

"Don't get caught in a debate over higher prices between housewives and farmers," he cautioned. "If you do, and have to choose a side, take the farmers' side. It's the right side, and besides, housewives aren't nearly as well organized."

These are unbelievable statements by the Democratic Secretary of Agriculture. The American people will find them unbelievable.

America's farmers and America's housewives will find them not only unbelievable but intolerable. A strong reaction to them is both certain and deserved.

The attitude revealed by these statements has consistently characterized the Johnson-Humphrey Administration. Its failure to tell the whole truth about inflation, about Vietnam, about taxation, about the poverty program, about Government employment, about foreign aid, about the budget, has been almost unequalled in our political history.

As the days go by will the Johnson-Humphrey Administration and its Democrat-controlled Congress continue to "slip, slide, and duck" the great and crucial issues that confront the Nation? Will the Great Unorganized of the Nation—the housewives, the majority of wage earners, the small businessmen, the independent professional people, parents, and the young people, be increasingly ignored because they do not fit the Freeman formula of "slip, slide, and duck" unless they're organized?

Among the Great Unorganized, too, are our schoolchildren—the very ones whose daily school milk Secretary Freeman and this Administration seek to cut back so drastically.

In further reference to our farm population, the Chicago Tribune story continues:

"There is a reaction far deeper and more bitter than I could ever have anticipated among the Nation's farmers over recent remarks by administration officials concerning farm prices," Freeman told the candidates. "Farmers know what tremendous minority they are and they are very sensitive."

Are we asked to assume from this disparaging reference that our farmers are an unimportant, as well as a sensitive, minority? Are we expected to conclude from this that the great unorganized majority of Americans are to be disregarded by the Johnson-Humphrey Administration in the months ahead? Can we expect, that not alone on the issue of inflation, but on every other issue of importance to our people, this wretched philosophy, this unworthy attitude, this shocking Freeman formula, will prevail?

Therefore, our Question of the Week:

Mr. President, will the Democrats "slip, slide, and duck" *every* issue?

August 5, 1966

By Senator Dirksen:

"* * * and besides, housewives aren't nearly as well organized." Thus spake Democratic Secretary Freeman. Must we conclude from this that the age of chivalry is indeed dead? Must we assume that America's housewives are of no consequence in the eyes of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration?

I, for one, do not believe that the age of chivalry has passed. Indeed, I like to believe it is in full flower, despite these Democratic spokesmen. As for Secretary Freeman's indifference to the Nation's

housewives, I can only conclude that he has sadly underestimated the power of America's women.

There is not a single issue of our time that is not of paramount concern to the housewives of America. Foremost among these are the issues of inflation and the war in Vietnam. None know their impact so intimately; none are more willing to make whatever sacrifice may be needed to solve them; none are so undeserving of such official scorn as the women who make the homes and shape the future of the Nation. I hope, indeed I am certain, that this downgrading of America's housewives will bring forth from them a resentment and a reaction that will be fierce and formidable.

During the past several months, we Republicans in loyal opposition have, in addition to the making of positive and constructive proposals for administrative and legislative action, addressed specific questions to the Johnson-Humphrey Administration. Our intentions in this have been honorable. Our objectives have been in the public interest. These questions, making reference to the important issues of the time, have read as follows:

(On the high cost of living):

Mr. President, what are you doing about the rising cost of living?

(On poverty):

Mr. President, why is the war on poverty being lost?

(On credibility):

Mr. President, what can we believe?

(On farm prices):

Mr. President, are you going to keep prices down on the farm?

(On foreign aid):

Mr. President, why are we losing our money and our friends?

(On inflation):

Mr. President, why do you brag about inflation?

To date, in reply to these questions, there has come from the Johnson-Humphrey Administration only a deep and pregnant silence, from which we can only assume that the Freeman formula of "slip, slide, and duck" is of much earlier origin and application than last week. Will the Democratic campaign theme song this year be: "We Will Slip, Slide, and Duck Our Way to Victory"?

In fairness to the Congress and the American people these questions should be answered, these issues must be faced, these problems must be solved. Republicans in Congress and across the country have repeated their willingness and demonstrated their ability to propose, and to cooperate fully with respect to, such solutions but in this great Republic of ours, the public interest requires that the majority show an equal readiness to cooperate, an equal willingness to face the facts squarely and with courage. The Freeman formula of "slip, slide, and duck" indicates quite clearly that the Administration and its overwhelming Democratic congressional majorities have neither the wit nor the wish nor the will to do so.

Therefore, our Question of the Week:

Mr. President, will the Democrats "slip, slide, and duck" every issue?

FOREIGN AID

July 22, 1966

By Senator Dirksen:

The foreign aid debate in the House of Representatives last week and the continuing debate in the Senate reflect increasingly not merely the concern but the anger and the alarm of the American people with regard to this program.

At the time of its inception in June of 1947, when our then Secretary of State, the late General Marshall, stimulated a massive program of financial assistance to war-torn Europe the need for and the merit of the program were clear. It is no longer true in Europe and in countless other nations around the world to whom the American taxpayers' dollars have been funneled year after year after year.

During these past two decades more than \$125 billion of our people's money have been shipped abroad for the announced purpose of stemming Communism, creating economic stability, encouraging representative government, and nourishing so-called underdeveloped nations.

Lately, these objectives have been poorly served. This global dole must be curtailed. The time to start is now.

In my more detailed remarks to this end on the Senate floor I have offered not only what I believe to be a reliable and a responsible criticism in detail with regard to the total foreign aid problem of today but have added, in equal detail, positive and constructive suggestions for immediate and ultimate remedy of many of the program's defects.

Getting dough out of Uncle Sam has become a way of life for the rest of the world—a very happy way of life for many foreign nations but a drain upon America's economic lifeblood that can no longer be tolerated.

Here at home, the General Accounting Office has conducted an almost surgical dissection of the foreign aid program in recent years which, if publicized in detail, would make not only our taxpayers but even the angels weep.

Not only has it required weeks of painstaking effort to learn the true facts about our foreign aid program which I have presented; it is infinitely more difficult—if not impossible—to learn from our alleged friends abroad just how they are spending our money, since in countless instances they will not permit even an elementary auditing of their books. How sharper than a serpent's tooth is an ungrateful friend!

Despite America's extraordinary generosity, Communism continues rampant over half the globe. We make no new friends and we are losing old ones. I am reminded of an old rhyme which reads:

When I had money, I had friends—
I loaned my money to my friends—
I asked my money of my friends—
And I lost my money and my friends.

Therefore, our Question of the Week:

Mr. President, why are we losing our money and our friends?

July 22, 1966

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

The budget, the President tells us, is in danger—and he calls upon Congress to make drastic cuts in it. He tells us that unless this Democrat-controlled Congress curbs its excessive spending, inflation is inevitable and that he will face the harsh choice of imposing controls or asking for a tax increase.

The recklessly swollen budget which he presented to the Congress is wholly his and his Administration's doing. The excessive spending to which he alludes with alarm can be stopped, overnight, by a word from him to his overwhelming Democratic majority in the Congress. Let me remind the President and his Democratic troops in the Congress that the Republicans have, for 18 months and more, been urging drastic cuts in nonessential Government spending.

The primary cause of the inflation which he now fears but which every other American has felt for months is that excessive Federal spending which from the first days of his Administration has been planned, proposed, and pushed.

The alternatives for checking this current inflation are indeed clear: a tax increase as the President intimated, wage and price controls, or a truly effective reduction in nonessential Federal spending. A reduction in nonessential Federal spending is the most desirable and urgent. The President and his top-heavy congressional majority can do this at once if they have the will to do so. Republicans will continue vigorously to support responsible reductions in nonessential Federal spending.

Senator Dirksen has made crystal clear, as have other Republicans in both the Senate and the House, one wide-open area in which just such a reduction in needless spending can be achieved—that of foreign aid.

Mounting evidence of waste in our foreign aid program in recent years is startling and shocking. It has been pinpointed and dramatized repeatedly not alone by the Republican minority but by the sound recommendations of such highly esteemed and wholly objective private groups as the International Economic Policy Association and the Administration's own bipartisan Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid.

1. Emphasis upon private investment projects; 2. Increase in our dollar earnings through Public Law 480; 3. Far more selective allocation of foreign aid; 4. Emphasis on aid to "self-help" nations; 5. A reexamination of the financing activities of the international lending institutions; 6. The imposing of a drastic new discipline upon the Agency for International Development; 7. Development of these foreign nations' own resources; 8. A hardheaded, cold-eyed demand that the nations to which we lend or grant funds meet their obligations to us honorably and in full or be promptly cut off—these are among the available, the very practical steps the Johnson-Humphrey Administration and its Democratic majority in Congress can take—and can take now.

Therefore, our Question of the Week:

Mr. President, why are we losing our money and our friends?

FOREIGN POLICY—THE ALL-ASIAN CONFERENCE

August 25, 1966

By the Republican Leadership of the Congress:

Never before in American history has this Nation been involved in a war more difficult, more unpopular, and so little understood. Never before has any Administration been so frustrated in its foreign policy or, as it now appears, so uncertain as to the next step to be taken.

As you know, a proposal has been made, initially by the Foreign Minister of Thailand, recommending the convening of an all-Asian conference to work toward a just and peaceful settlement of the war in Vietnam.

Because the securing of a just and honorable peace is the clear desire of every loyal American, we believe that the proposal of an all-Asian peace conference deserves prompt and thorough consideration. To those who remind us needlessly that neither Communist China nor Communist North Vietnam would attend such a conference, we reply that neither would the United States be a participant, but we endorse unhesitatingly such a peace-seeking effort by all other Asian nations. That Asian Communists disapprove or would oppose such a conference should not surprise nor discourage us nor should it impede such an endeavor by men of good will elsewhere in Asia.

To those who recommend a reconvening of the Geneva Conference, we must insist that such an approach is no longer viable nor valid, because the approach must come from the Asian nations themselves. A peaceful and honorable settlement of the conflict in Vietnam cannot now be originated, formulated or influenced by non-Asian interests. Only under Asian skies, under Asian auspices, under Asian responsibility and guidance can such a move now be made with genuine hope of success.

The Republican Leadership emphasizes again its wholehearted support of our Armed Forces in southeast Asia. We reaffirm our determination that Communist aggression in South Vietnam shall be overcome and that peace with freedom shall be reestablished in that troubled land.

Our encouragement and endorsement of the proposal of an all-Asian peace conference represents, in one respect, a new and important Republican foreign policy position. It emphasizes once more, however, our determination that the Republican Party shall continue strongly to maintain its historic and cherished position as the party of peace.

FOREIGN POLICY—RED TRADE

October 13, 1966

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

On the front page of the New York Times on Tuesday, October 4, in adjoining columns, there appeared the following news reports. The first was headed: "Soviet Announces New Pact for Aid to Hanoi's Regime. Additional program includes assistance for economy and military needs." The second was headed: "Air Talks Revived by United States and Soviet * * * Service may be opened next spring."

In the very same week the conflict in Vietnam became the third largest war America has ever fought. American troop strength in

Vietnam now totals more than 325,000 men, 23,000 more than in the Korean war. The latest U.S. casualty figures report 967 killed and wounded in 1 week, the highest in any 7-day period so far.

For many months the Russians have supplied—in ever increasing volume—the weapons and ammunition that are killing American boys every day.

As thousands of American boys fight, bleed, and die in Vietnam—as the Soviet Union—Communist Russia—announces an enormous further increase in its economic and military aid to our enemies—this Administration must stop—and stop now—its trafficking with the Russians in ways that can only result in Communist encouragement, growth, and enrichment.

And on Friday, October 7, the President of the United States, in addressing the National Conference of Editorial Writers, proudly proclaimed:

We have just signed a new United States-Soviet cultural agreement.

We intend to press for legislative authority to negotiate trade agreements which would extend most-favored-nation tariff treatment to European Communist states.

We have just concluded an air agreement with the Soviet Union.

And today I am announcing the following new steps:

We will reduce export controls on East-West trade with respect to hundreds of nonstrategic items.

I have just today signed a determination that will allow the Export-Import Bank to guarantee commercial credits to four additional Eastern European countries—Poland and Hungary, Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia * * *. The Export-Import Bank is prepared to finance exports for the Soviet-Italian Fiat auto plant.

We are negotiating a civil air agreement with the Soviet Union * * *.

And with this announcement the President of the United States included the comment: "This is good business and this will help us * * *." If dealing with the enemy—who are dealing in nothing but death to Americans in Vietnam—is good business, then truth and honor have indeed been perverted beyond recall by this administration.

In 1952, the Eisenhower administration ended the Korean war and kept the peace without surrender. That Administration's policy: insistence that Communists toe the line in deeds and performance, refusal to accept Communist words and promises.

Until the Communist world convinces us by act, not by word, that it not only seeks peace but will so act as to preserve peace among men, we will not be a party to any deal, any agreement, any arrangement, any treaty with Communists anywhere in the world. Until we—and our allies—commit ourselves without qualification to such a policy of strength we can expect only more Koreas, more Vietnams, and an ever widening spread of Communist subversion, deceit, and death dealing around the globe.

Therefore, our Question of the Week:

Mr. President: At home and abroad, what now—what next?

FOREIGN POLICY—VIETNAM

June 9, 1968

By Senator Dirksen:

James Madison, fourth President of the United States, at a time when our Nation was imperiled, wrote:

Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and a people who mean to be their own governors must arm themselves with power knowledge gives. A popular government without popular information or the means of acquiring it, is but a prologue to a farce or a tragedy or perhaps both.

Our Nation is imperiled now.

On December 13 last, the Republican Coordinating Committee, in a statement unanimously agreed to by its membership, declared its own conviction and position with respect to the conflict in Vietnam. The first two sentences of that declaration were these:

Questions are being raised both at home and abroad as to the devotion of the American people to peace. One cause of this confusion has been the inability of the Johnson Administration to establish a candid and consistently credible statement of our position in Vietnam.

The two words, "candid" and "credible" are those most meaningful and most relevant to the point we make today: The Johnson-Humphrey Administration refuses even yet to be either candid or consistently credible with respect to its policies and our position in Vietnam.

If, this, like Madison's, is a time of clear and present danger, it is essential now, as it was then, that the people be fully informed as to the problems and the perils confronting them and as to the effective steps it is planned to take to solve those problems and protect them from those perils.

All too consistently, the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has failed, whether by oversight or intent, to take the Congress and the American people into its proper confidence regarding Vietnam. Such a failure is inexcusable. It could be tragic.

No American, in public office or in private life, wishes or seeks to know the details of any plan or program that must, in the interest of our national security, be kept in executive confidence, but every American does have the right to know where we are going in Vietnam and how far and to what clear purpose. Such information as has been given us by the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has been infrequent and incomplete.

For this reason, therefore, I urge again that the President convene immediately a bipartisan leadership conference for a discussion and examination of American policy in Vietnam. I urge this in order that the American people through their elected representatives in the Congress might better understand the shape of things to come. Armed by such understanding, they will be better able to provide that unqualified support so necessary to the winning of a swift, secure, and honorable peace.

Unless, by such means, the people are respected in their right to know we cannot help but ask this Question of the Week—and, indeed, of every week:

Mr. President, what can we believe?

INFLATION

February 24, 1966

By Senator Dirksen:

The American people are involved in a three-front war—in Vietnam, against poverty, and now against inflation. Government directly or indirectly controls the money supply. Inflation has swept in upon us because of policies this Administration has adopted. Every major modern inflation has been aggravated by excessive Government spending. And that has been the deliberate policy of the Democratic administrations for the past 5 years.

This Administration has told us it is promoting inflation as a step toward fuller employment. What they have not told the American people is the extent and cruelty of the burden they have placed on the very poor through this policy of printing money at a rate twice that of our population growth.

The Johnson Administration, now concerned with inflation, prepares to meet it by higher taxes rather than through a prudent budget. This year's budget is \$31 billion higher than the last Eisenhower budget and Democrats have added \$32 billion to the public debt in 5 years. As most American workers know payroll tax increases since January 1 have already more than wiped out those tax cuts of a year ago. And there's more to come, more even than the \$4.8 billion tax increases now before Congress. The Administration is talking in terms of another 5 percent income tax increase and an added 2 percent corporate tax later this year. These increases are over and above the cruel tax of inflation which is already waging war on those with the lowest incomes.

Higher personal income taxes hit hardest those who can least afford them—the young people who are starting a family, building a home and building a future, those in our society on fixed incomes and those who have the least.

There are alternatives. One is to trim the budget which, the President refuses to do except in areas where he knows the cuts will be restored. Another is tighter credit—but when that was tried Democrats wailed in anguish.

This Administration has made its choice: It plans to discipline the American people rather than discipline itself.

February 24, 1966

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

Economists talk of inflation in terms of a sharp rise in the amount of money or credit, or both, relative to goods available for purchase. The American housewife has a sharper definition: You pay more for less.

Bacon was \$1.15 a pound at a chainstore here in Washington Monday morning. Eggs were 71 cents a dozen. An American favorite—pork chops—were \$1.35 a pound. Mothers used to be able to save their budgets with hamburger. But that's climbed to 59 cents a pound. And very, very little of this increase has found its way into the farmers' pocket.

Food prices have climbed 3.7 percent in 1 year. And this accounts for a major part in the overall 2 percent rise in the cost of living in

the past 12 months. Republicans on the Joint Economic Committee say it is inevitable that prices will rise by another 2 to 3 percent in 1966. That's a rise of 5 percent in 2 years. This amounts to a 5-percent sales tax on everything you buy. And you'll pay it because of the inflationary policies of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration. The housewife's \$10 in 1961 now buys only \$9.14 at the grocery store.

Inflation steals from everybody, but hurts most those 26 million Americans who live on pensions or other fixed incomes. It will also certainly do much to nullify whatever benefits might otherwise accrue from programs now pursued in the antipoverty war.

President Johnson says this Administration has produced an "American economic miracle." Will the American people call it a miracle after they pay their bills and then dig deep enough to pay the big tax increase the Johnson-Humphrey Administration wants?

The National Commission on Food Marketing reports Americans are eating less beef and far less pork now than they did a year ago. The Johnson-Humphrey Administration set out to change America and the American way of life. The Administration seems to be succeeding—and you won't like it.

July 28, 1966

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

Higher prices—higher costs—higher interest rates—higher wages—higher rents—higher taxes. Add them all together and they spell inflation, no matter how you look at them from any point in the economy.

No thinking person—no hard-pressed taxpayer—can help but be alarmed by the pace of this inflation which, for many months now, has been taking the tax dollars from his pocket far more rapidly than he can earn them.

Republicans in Congress and across the Nation are of course taking issue with the Johnson-Humphrey Administration in its refusal to take the necessary action to stop these skyrocketing costs of living. But ours is a protest in which millions of Americans of all political faiths and on all economic levels are now joining. The chart on display here today illustrates the facts of inflation vividly. This chart reveals, in clear and simple terms, the rate of increase of consumer prices from June of 1957 to this very month of July 1966.

The increase shown is alarming. The rate of increase indicated is frightening. The refusal of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration to check nonessential Federal spending and to stem this inflation is beyond all understanding.

When the Government's own Bureau of Labor Statistics records the cold, harsh fact that the rate of increase in living costs during the past 6 months was the highest in the past 8 years, the issue is clear for all to see: unless these jet-propelled living costs are checked, the results could spell not just inflation but disaster for every American pocket-book.

If this gravest of economic problems could not be solved, we would feel hopeless and helpless indeed. But it can be—and by a means immediately at hand: the reduction of nonessential Federal spending by the Johnson-Humphrey Administration and its Democrat-dominated Congress.

This is the Administration whose leader in a speech in Des Moines, Iowa, on June 30 said:

When these folks start talking to you about inflation, you tell them that is something you only have to worry about in Democratic administrations.

Seldom has such a public confession been heard!

This is the Johnson-Humphrey Administration whose leader urges everyone else to economize—the housewife to select cheaper cuts of meat, the workingman to hold to wage “guideposts,” the businessman to review his budget, the manufacturer to restrict his spending. Yet this same leader refuses to urge his overwhelming Democratic majority on Capitol Hill to economize in the only way that has any real meaning for every American family.

Republicans in Congress and throughout the Nation have for many months now not only seen clearly, but have identified accurately, both the causes of and the cure for these costs of living that threaten all our people. The Johnson-Humphrey Administration has, with its head in the economic sand, been either unwilling or unable to admit these harsh facts of domestic life in America today. We wonder why.

Therefore, our Question of the Week:

Mr. President, why do you brag about inflation?

July 28, 1966

By Senator Dirksen:

The President has been gambling with our economy and, despite the warnings of friend and foe over many months, he has been losing steadily. The stakes of the game have been, and are, the well-being of the American people and the point of no concern has long since been passed.

The Republicans in Congress, together with Republicans and millions of worried Americans across the Nation, have been pointing with alarm for more than a year to what was so clearly happening to their pocketbooks and to the Nation's economic welfare. The time of reckoning so long foreseen has arrived.

The late H. G. Wells, in another connection, once remarked:

I am not prophesying now; I am simply running along beside the marching facts and pointing at them.

We have been prophesying also, month after month after month. We have been running along beside the marching facts and pointing at them, with increasing concern and alarm. But we have been doing far more than this. Republicans have offered the solution to inflation and have consistently worked to help achieve that solution by cutting back all nonessential Federal expenditures.

We have, first and foremost, demanded that nonessential Federal expenditures be drastically reduced. We have urged that immediate action be taken to reduce foreign aid. At our insistence—and only with our help—the prospect of a reduction in foreign aid of over \$400 million in this coming year now exists.

We have urged, again and again, that any number of the nonessential, Great Society programs that have been proposed and are being

pushed be delayed, if not curtailed, in order that the cost of living for every American might be reduced. In this we have not yet been given a meaningful hearing nor any cooperation by the Johnson-Humphrey Administration.

If nonessential Federal expenditures are substantially reduced—and the initiation of new programs slowed down or eliminated—as they clearly can be without the slightest detriment to our peoples' well-being—there would be no need for the wage and price controls to which the President has referred. There would be no need for the higher taxes to which he alludes. There would be no need for the huge inflationary budget deficit which, as an alternative, he foresees.

The way out of this inflationary jungle is clear. The need for taking it is imperative. Because these things are so, we cannot understand, nor can millions upon millions of our people understand, why the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has lost sight of the commonsense forest in its obsession with the Great Society trees.

Therefore, our Question of the Week:

Mr. President, why do you brag about inflation?

(And, we might add, what are you going to do about it?)

September 1, 1966.

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

Former President Truman had for several years on his desk a motto which read: "The buck stops here!" In this Johnson Administration that motto appears to have been changed to: "Slip, slide, and duck the buck!"

As the recent airline strike continued, the President passed the buck to the Congress.

As labor increases its demands, the President passes the buck in silence.

As industry raises its prices, the President passes the buck to the consumer.

As the cost of food continues to skyrocket in the market, the President passes the buck to the housewife.

As interest rates reach alltime highs and home mortgage money becomes almost impossible to obtain, the President passes the buck to those millions of our people of modest means, both younger and older, who have hoped for years to have a home of their own.

As too long a mistaken reliance on monetary policy alone fails in the slightest to halt inflation, the President passes the buck to us all. For it is the American people, each and all of us, who continue to suffer increasingly from this buckpassing fever of the Johnson Administration.

Inflation—a dollar declining in value—the cost of living in orbit—call it what you will, in simplest terms it means that the American wage earner, the American taxpayer, is being cruelly misled and badly hurt.

This Administration appears totally helpless, and, even worse, hopeless, in its futile thrashing about for solutions. When our people are given no help—worse yet, when they are given no hope—it's time for a drastic change.

We repeat—and we shall continue to repeat it until action results—we repeat that the solution to our rushing inflation is at hand—a solution instantly available to this Administration and its topheavy majority in this Democratic Congress. That solution: a drastic cut in nonessential Federal spending. It is these billions of nonessential Federal funds that are being poured into the economy that represent the principal cause of inflation, the principal reason for today's high living costs for every family.

The President has asked housewives to buy cheaper cuts of meat. He has suggested that wage and price guideposts—which he himself has torpedoed—be observed. He has requested Government agencies to economize. He has supported none of these things with any vigor at all. There has been no evidence that he means it.

On the contrary he points with peculiar pride to a wartime economy that inevitably produces high employment.

With nearly 3,100,000 men in uniform not now employable in civilian life—in the face of the known fact that at least 3 men are needed in the labor force at home to provide for each man in uniform—we suggest that the President's boasting has a very hollow ring.

We believe that the time has come for the President of the United States to stop passing the buck with the responsibilities that are his—his responsibilities to labor, to management, to the consumer, to the taxpayer, to all the American people. He can bring about a drastic cut in nonessential Federal expenditures through his huge Democratic majorities in the Congress, if he is willing to do so—if he has the courage to do so.

Therefore, our Question of the Week:

Mr. President, When Will You Democrats Stop Passing the Buck?

September 1, 1966

By Senator Dirksen:

President Johnson tells us that what America needs is "a strong dose of self-discipline." To which we can only reply: "Physician, heal thyself."

To ask self-discipline of labor, to ask self-discipline of management, to ask self-discipline of Congress, to ask self-discipline of the consumer, is pious and pointless—until the President asks it of his Administration and his heavy Democratic majorities in the Congress. We are, in short, not impressed.

We are not impressed by timid surrender to labor unions. We are not impressed by fearful deference to management. We are not impressed by "guideposts" for wages and prices that are anything but. We are not impressed by his requests for those reductions in appropriations by Congress—such as school milk and school lunch programs—that the President knows cannot be made. We are not impressed by the intriguing fiction of Mr. McNamara's new math, which claims a doubtful savings of billions. We are not impressed by anything, in short, but a clear and courageous demonstration on the part of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration that it has the will and the courage to put the brakes on inflation—to stop the skyrocketing cost of living—by the powerful means it has readily at hand: the drastic, sweeping reduction of nonessential Federal spending.

We have said before and we repeat, that Republicans in Congress and across the country have for months urged such reductions and have shown clearly where they could be made.

When the Congress was given the Johnson-Humphrey budget for 1967, the Republican Leadership and the Republican membership of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees identified, item by item, those programs where nonessential spending could be cut by hundreds of millions of dollars—and this without depriving our fighting forces of a single thing they need!

The President and his Democratic majorities in Congress have refused to make such savings, despite repeated and valiant Republican efforts to achieve them. Even now, at this point in the appropriations calendar, it is still possible to effect a savings—in nonessential spending—of hundreds of millions of dollars if the President and his congressional majorities really want to fight inflation.

These, let me emphasize, represent savings in things that we can do without—just as the housewife is asked to do without, just as the wage earner is asked to do without, just as the would-be homeowner is asked to do without—just as American fighting men are being asked to do without the privileges of peace in the frightful jungles of Asia.

We cannot have both guns and butter. We cannot fight a war in Asia and win the war on inflation at home unless this Government of ours, this Administration, is equally willing to do without and to stop its willful, reckless spending of the people's money on nonessential things.

I am in total and enthusiastic agreement with Jerry Ford that the only effective means available to fight inflation, to stem the high cost of living, is to cut nonessential Federal spending drastically and to do it now. The President and his Democratic congressional majorities have the power so to serve this Nation. We cannot help but wonder why they have been unwilling to do so.

Therefore, our Question of the Week:

Mr. President, When Will You Democrats Stop Passing the Buck?

INFLATION—THE RISING COSTS OF LIVING

March 31, 1966

By Senator Dirksen:

This debt-propelled Johnson-Humphrey Administration continues, whether knowingly or not, to mislead the American people on matters of the most vital importance to them. Whether this Johnson-Humphrey Administration is misinformed, misguided, or simply mystified is hard to determine. It is, in any case, mistaken—and the cost of its mistakes in human well-being and in dollars is rapidly becoming far more than the American people can—or will—pay.

The Johnson-Humphrey Administration was grossly mistaken in its budgetary planning, both as regards the cost of the war in Vietnam and expenditures here at home. Fifteen months ago, after proclaiming "an important first step toward a balanced budget" the Administration produced a deficit of over \$3 billion. The fiscal 1966 deficit will be at least twice that of the 1965 deficit.

In June of 1965 Representative Laird of Wisconsin predicted that estimates of the cost of the war in Vietnam were low by at least \$5 billion, only to be harshly rebuked by the Secretary of Defense. Yet, in a matter of months, the Johnson-Humphrey Administration requested of Congress nearly \$13 billion in supplemental appropriations for continued conduct of the war.

The Johnson-Humphrey Administration has also been 100 percent mistaken in its estimates of the inflationary forces now stampeding across the country that take the earnings right out of the pocket of the worker—and this despite the early and unanimous warnings not only of dozens of economists outside Government but the equally strong and unanimous warnings of members of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress.

The Johnson-Humphrey Administration has proposed—and has tried to impose—economic guidelines for labor, for management, and for the farmer. Democrats are even proposing controls on wages and prices yet the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has made no effort to place guidelines upon its own inflationary excesses.

The Johnson-Humphrey Administration is obsessed with symptoms rather than causes.

The role of the opposition is one of both searching criticism and constructive proposal of alternatives. I commend to you the 13 positive recommendations for effective action in bringing down the cost of living presented earlier this week to the American people by the Republican Coordinating Committee.

REPUBLICAN COORDINATING COMMITTEE—THE RISING COSTS OF LIVING

The Republican Party makes the following recommendations:

1. That the Administration prepare and submit promptly to the Congress a new budget for fiscal 1967 which reflects a valid surplus, achieved by postponing or eliminating nondefense expenditures.
2. That the costs of Vietnam be financed within annual balanced budgets by reduction or postponement of domestic programs, not by tax increases.
3. That in times of high-level prosperity and employment, the Administration provide a significant surplus in the Federal budget to reduce inflationary pressures and help protect the dollar.
4. That the Administration pursue prudent fiscal and monetary policies that will make it unnecessary to have the so-called "voluntary" wage and price "guideposts," which are inconsistent with a free market economy.
5. That the Administration lend support to monetary policies which will hold increases in the supply of money to a pace consistent with inflation-free economic growth.
6. That the Administration respect and defend the role of the Federal Reserve System as an independent agency within Government.
7. That the Congress amend the Employment Act of 1946 to make general price stability an explicit objective of Government policy, along with maximum employment, production and purchasing power.
8. That the Congress remove the unrealistic interest ceiling on Government bonds, to permit noninflationary management of the national debt.

9. That, rather than relying on inflationary monetary and fiscal policies to reduce residual unemployment in a high employment economy, the Administration place emphasis on selective programs of job training, counseling, and placement, as provided in the Republican-sponsored Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and have the Bureau of the Census undertake a survey of job vacancies and a census of the unemployed at intervals to provide a factual basis for such activities.

10. That the Administration give high priority to developing a solution to the balance-of-payments problem which will be lasting and constructive for the rest of the world as well as for ourselves (see, "The Balance of Payments, The Gold Drain and Your Dollar," a report of the Republican Coordinating Committee, Aug. 30, 1965).

11. That the Administration enhance the integrity and value of the Federal budgeting process by:

(a) The annual dissemination of a 5-year budget projection for all departments and agencies, to assist long-term consideration of the fiscal consequences of new programs.

(b) An annual reporting, as part of the budget, of the unfunded commitments of the Government for future spending which have to be met by the taxpayers.

12. That the Administration consolidate and, where appropriate, eliminate as many as possible of the overlapping and duplicating Government programs and, where practical, take steps to turn their administration over to States and local governmental bodies.

13. That the Congress create, at regular intervals, an independent, bipartisan, adequately staffed "Hoover Commission"-type organization, composed of Members of the Congress and the public, to review the budget, Government programs, and Government organization.

April 21, 1966

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

The following quotations are excerpts from the Dallas Morning News—that's the Dallas, Tex., Morning News of April 15, ladies and gentlemen:

President Johnson's chief economic adviser revealed (in Austin) Thursday that he doesn't place much stock in the American housewife's judgment on inflation.

Gardner Ackley, speaking at the University of Texas said he received numerous letters from homemakers blaming him personally for high food prices.

"But housewives are notoriously poor judges of what's happening to prices except for food," he quipped during a press conference.

And Ackley claims that, even on the supermarket level, the housewife is no expert.

"She notices when the price of a pork chop or a head of lettuce goes up," he noted, "but she's not always aware when the price comes down."

I just can't believe that any Administration or other Government spokesman could so misjudge or so underrate the American housewife and homemaker!

Who knows better how rapidly inflation is eating away the family income day by day? Who knows better, who feels more painfully, the rising costs of living as, week by week, those costs discourage every American family in its hopes for the future?

Mr. Ackley, from his privileged economic sanctuary, sadly and cruelly underestimates the knowledge and the power of America's women and I hope that he and the Johnson-Humphrey Administration and the Congress will hear from every American home and hearth on this subject, by letter and by telegram, in the days ahead. I urge every American homemaker to take pen in hand and tell us now—what you know—how you feel—about these terribly harsh, constantly rising costs of living.

Meanwhile, back at the ranch, the Johnson-Humphrey Administration hesitates, vacillates, and procrastinates in taking necessary action to stop these skyrocketing living costs. Again, Mr. Ackley, in reply to a question as to what will happen if we get into an inflationary period: "It depends on how you define inflation. I wouldn't say we'd had much inflation." Will America's homemakers agree? And the President and his Secretary of the Treasury continue to wonder when or whether to "apply the brakes." This, despite the report of the Department of Commerce on the gross national product increase, released Monday, April 18, and stating that more than one-third of the increase in the dollar total represented higher prices and stating further that "the accelerated price increase in the first quarter is largely attributable to the steep rise in food prices."

There are two major fiscal brakes available—either a tax increase or a drastic cut in needless spending—yet the Johnson-Humphrey Administration, with constantly contradictory comments, will not tell the American people truthfully what it proposes or plans.

This, therefore, is our Question of the Week:

Mr. President, what are you doing about the rising costs of living?

April 21, 1966

By Senator Dirksen:

The Government of the United States is the biggest business in the world. It is the biggest borrower, the biggest lender, the biggest hoarder, the biggest spender, the biggest landlord, the biggest tenant, the biggest employer, and the biggest provider in the history of mankind. Inevitably the biggest business in the world has the biggest budget in the world.

No one can claim, of course, that a family budget is or should be comparable, but no one can deny that every family budget is just as important to the wage earner and the homemaker who control it.

If a family's income is not adequate to meet its expenses, the family has only two alternatives: to increase that income or to reduce those expenditures, yet there seems to be no recognition of this whatever in the Johnson-Humphrey Administration.

In a recent appearance before Agriculture Department employees, the President said:

We in Government cannot afford the luxury of thinking that nothing so needs reforming as other people's habits.

As public servants we know—at least we ought to know—that the habits most in need of reform are our own.

How very true.

What he actually said, or course, was: don't do as I do, do as I say, for, quite obviously, while the Johnson-Humphrey Administration's spending habits are in need of drastic reform the President is making no evident effort whatever to reform them and he and his colleagues continue to allude repeatedly to a possible tax increase while urging all others, but not themselves, to reduce expenditures.

The President hasn't hesitated to ask business, to ask labor, to ask the housewives of America to reduce their spending. Why hasn't he asked the Congress to do the same? On the contrary, hardly a month goes by without a request from him for more and more and more spending of the people's money for low priority, nondefense projects and programs.

I have said before, and I say again, that the role of the opposition must be one of both searching criticism and constructive proposal of alternatives. There has now been published for release today the full text of the Republican Coordinating Committee's report entitled "The Rising Costs of Living—A Report on the Fiscal Policies of the Federal Government," approved at the committee's last meeting March 28. A summary of the report was released at that time, but the text contains an extensive amount of detail in support of the report's conclusions and recommendations. The report was based on a study made by the Task Force on Federal Fiscal and Monetary Policies of which former Budget Director Maurice H. Stans is chairman.

I commend this report to your attention and study and I urge you to invite your readers to write to the Members of Congress for copies of it. The role of the opposition of which I speak must not be one of "Me, too," nor yet one of "Not me." Rather, it must be one of "Here's how." On the harsh question of inflation, with which every homemaker and wage earner is living so painfully today, "Here's how."

The alternatives, as has been said, are clear—either higher taxes or a reduction in spending, yet we have no equally clear idea from this administration as to which path we will be taking.

Therefore, our Question of the Week:

Mr. President, What Are You Doing About the Rising Costs of Living?

L.B.J.—PUBLIC CONFIDENCE

October 13, 1966

By Senator Dirksen:

The President has referred to the Republican Party as the party of fear, and, moreover, as having no constructive programs to fight inflation, no programs to ease racial tension. He accused us of not knowing what to do about crime in the streets or how to end the war in Vietnam.

Is the President bewildered? Was he referring to his Administration? His statements actually spell out the most damning self-indictment in modern political history!

There is only one thing wrong with these Presidential statements about the Republican Party. Like so much else voiced by this Administration, they simply are not true.

We do not admit to being a party of fear. An honest reading of history will prove the contrary. But we do admit as a people, to being concerned about this Administration and the many unwise courses it has chosen to take.

What lies ahead of us in Vietnam, under this Administration's leadership, we cannot foresee. We are concerned about high and rising living costs, in the face of which this Administration has been helpless. We are concerned—indeed, we know—that we are losing our money and our friends abroad. We are concerned—for it is a fact—that the "war on poverty" is being lost, with the poor and the underprivileged receiving little actual help and with millions of the people's dollars being wasted. We are concerned—for we can prove—that the farm and consumer are, calculatingly, being played ruthlessly against one another. We are concerned—for the proof is undeniable—that an echo-chamber Democratic Congress, with its steamroller majorities, will continue, without thought or question, to carry out the slightest whim and wish of this Administration. We are concerned—for the signs are frightening—that we are being led down the road to national bankruptcy. We are concerned that an all-Asian Peace Conference—a practical first step toward peace in Vietnam—has now been summarily rejected as a peace hope. We are concerned—for we are convinced—that the American people are not being told the whole truth about their Government and this Administration's plans for them.

Of the charge that the Republican Party has no constructive programs or policies we can only assume that this Administration has from its very first days been blind, deaf, and indifferent. To this statement I attach a listing of the specific, positive, constructive recommendations and programs which the Republican Leadership and the Republican Party across the country have presented to the Congress, the Administration, and the American people month after month after month. I would remind the leader of the Democratic Party that his Administration has chosen, to our people's detriment, either to ignore or to reject these recommendations, the majority of which would have gone far to correct abuses spawned by the Administration and which would have prevented this onset of confusion and concern.

When the President chooses to speak directly and candidly to the American people, the Republican Leadership and the Republican Party will be attentive and responsive but when the President chooses to do otherwise, we are indeed apprehensive and concerned. We hope—we pray—that in the weeks to come we will witness Administration, deeds calculated to inspire faith, not fear, belief, not doubt, confidence, not concern, hope and not despair.

Therefore, our Question of the Week:

Mr. President: At Home and Abroad, What Now—What Next?

REPUBLICAN PROPOSALS AND PROGRAMS

A chronology of constructive recommendations

June 1965.....	U.S. foreign policy in Vietnam.
August 1965.....	The balance of payments.
September 1965.....	Equality in America—a promise unfulfilled.
December 1965.....	Vietnam policy statement.
December 1965.....	Toward a stronger Federal system.
December 1965.....	Toward fair elections in America.
Mar. 7, 1966.....	(Economic) Opportunity Crusade Act of 1966.
March 1966.....	The case for revenue sharing.
March 1966.....	Latin America-United States—progress or failure?
March 1966.....	The human investment—job opportunities.
March 1966.....	The rising costs of living.
June 1966.....	The United Nations.
June 1966.....	Effective water management.
June 1966.....	The challenge of the modern metropolis.
June 1966.....	Federal, State, and local responsibilities for problems of education.
June 1966.....	Transportation in modern America.
June 1966.....	Housing and urban development.
June 1966.....	The alleviation of poverty.
June 1966.....	Jobs and people—job opportunities.
June 1966.....	The needs of the aging.

NOTE.—Each of the above was published by the Republican Coordinating Committee with the exception of the Economic Opportunity Crusade Act of 1966, which originated with eight Republican members of the House Education and Labor Committee.

 MEDICARE

March 29, 1966

By the Republican Leadership of the Congress:

The Republican Leadership today introduced medicare legislation to extend through August 31, 1966, the initial enrollment period for coverage under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged.

Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen and Representative Gerald R. Ford announced the filing of identical bills for this purpose in the Senate and House of Representatives in fulfillment of the Republican Coordinating Committee pledge to do so.

The law presently requires registration for these benefits by March 31 but once it became clear that over 5 million older persons would be unable to register by that date, the Republican Leadership took action to prevent the denial of such benefits to these millions of citizens.

The supplemental benefits portion of the law was added to medicare on the insistence of Republican Congressman John W. Byrnes of Wisconsin. Republican congressional agreement and insistence upon extension of the enrollment period is unanimous.

WAR ON POVERTY

March 3, 1966

By Senator Dirksen:

The Johnson-Humphrey Administration by July first will have spent \$2.3 billion on the antipoverty campaign and is asking for \$1.7 billion more. For these vast sums the American people and the poor have gotten a very shabby product. This program is expensive in terms of money and experienced manpower. It has produced many press releases and high professional salaries but little assistance for those who most need it.

The campaign has been marked by political favoritism and too often has become the tool of political machines. What possible excuse is there for putting children of local politicians and high-income families into the Neighborhood Youth Corps designed to keep poor children from dropping out of school?

The program has been marked by political infighting between local Democratic politicians for control of community action program funds. They want the money to build political machines, not to reclaim and dignify human lives.

Mass creation of extravagant Job Corps centers, a lack of discipline and purpose, have resulted in disillusionment, rioting, and vicious gang rule. The Job Corps budget last year averaged \$7,800 for each enrollee for 1 year, almost twice the cost of sending a boy to college. This, it would seem, could have provided at least minimal screening which would have helped turn these camps into the "residential skill centers" long advocated by Republicans.

Scandalous misuse of funds, involving fraud, has led to Justice Department and Congressional inquiries in a number of areas.

These things need not be. They would not be a part of a properly administered program. Those with the lowest incomes in this country cannot benefit from chicanery, fraud, and political misuse of funds.

The antipoverty campaign was launched with a flurry of publicity by the Johnson-Humphrey Administration. It promised much, and raised the hopes of many, but so far has produced little. The needy must have hope and must be involved in developing their own future. They need help in helping themselves—now.

March 3, 1966

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

To win a war on poverty low-income families must have better education, a chance at getting decent jobs and help in helping themselves. To accomplish these goals Republicans recommend:

1. Low-income families must become more directly and deeply involved if the campaign is to succeed. Their capable representatives should be elected to serve along with representatives of local officials and social welfare agencies on boards with clearly defined authority. Only through such sound local administration and less intervention from Washington can this program shed the political money grubbing found in so many cities.

2. Operation Headstart, first suggested by Republicans in 1961, has been moderately successful despite administrative bungling but

that program now threatens to grind to a halt. It should be encouraged to reach its maximum potential.

3. Productive jobs in private enterprise are the real keys to success. To provide dignified and permanent employment private industry and labor unions must be given realistic incentives—such as the Republican proposal for a Human Investment Act—to widen their participation.

4. Authority and responsibility of the States must be strengthened and they must be brought in as partners to prevent the antipoverty campaign from becoming more deeply mired in bureaucracy.

5. To eliminate de facto racial segregation in many urban renewal projects adequate housing must be provided for all dispossessed families.

6. Waste, abuse of power, political influence, and big city bossism can be eliminated by applying the Hatch Act at all levels and through preaudits and tighter accounting. A thorough, honest investigation of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration's handling of the antipoverty war is long overdue. To conduct such an inquiry we are today introducing legislation to create a joint Senate-House bipartisan investigating committee.

June 2, 1966

By Senator Dirksen:

The Republican membership of the House Education and Labor Committee have done the Congress and the Nation a signal service in the detailed and vigorous minority report they have issued on the so-called war on poverty program of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration.

In a speech in the Senate on August 19, 1965, I identified the erratic, costly, and misdirected course this program was then threatening to take. The Republican minority have now confirmed in every detail the most ominous of my predictions where the genuine welfare of the poor and the dreadful costs to the American taxpayer were concerned. This minority report will be printed and available within a day or so and I not only commend it to your attention but strongly urge your careful reading of it. I urge, moreover, that you in turn urge your readers and listeners to write their respective Members of the Congress for copies of it. I have seen nothing in a good number of years that will so alert and alarm our people as to the reckless course the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has now clearly laid out before us.

Constructively and positively, I therefore urge—

1. That the President institute immediately a thorough review and reappraisal of this disastrous poverty program under the Congressional resolutions to this end that have already been filed by me and by Representative Ford and that at the same time he examine objectively and honestly the increasingly harsh impact of the high cost of living upon the American people.

2. The adoption by the Congress and the Administration of the strong clear recommendations of the Opportunity Crusade contained in this superb minority report.

When the Representatives of the American people in Congress are asked to appropriate another \$1½ billion for a poverty program that has already wastefully consumed \$2½ billions, the people are fully

justified in demanding an explanation of this disastrous program and of how it is now proposed to spend still more of their hard-earned and rapidly vanishing income in this wasteful, reckless way.

Therefore, our Question of the Week:

Mr. President, Why Is the War on Poverty Being Lost?

June 2, 1966

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

At the very outset, let me join with Senator Dirksen in urging your readers and your listeners to ask their respective Members of Congress for copies of this historic minority report on the poverty program as soon as the Democrat-controlled committee makes it available. Our people not only have the right to know the harsh facts of that program but, as they now struggle at every income level to make both ends meet, they must be told how frightfully, how disastrously their dollars are being spent in this incredibly mismanaged, almost totally unproductive program of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration.

A very prominent Democrat has used the phrase "the arrogance of power" with respect to his own Administration's foreign policy. That phrase "arrogance of power" far more aptly describes this poverty program: in the day-to-day administration of that program in countless communities across the country, in the highhanded, steam-rolling of poverty legislation in the House Education and Labor Committee and in the repeated defiance hurled at many of the Governors of our States and mayors of our cities by poverty office bureaucrats.

We Republicans in opposition contend that, in this as on almost every domestic front, the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has regularly substituted promises for performance. When such a policy is applied to the poor it becomes not only harsh, not only cruel, but intolerable and unforgivable.

Let it be clear, however, that this is by no means a partisan political point of view. Repeated statements on the subject by prominent and dedicated Democrats in the Congress have included such poverty program charges and phrases as "disastrous," "Programs now mired in the swamp of mediocrity," "a riot and a runaway of ineffective programs," "The rural areas * * * have * * * been lost in the shuffle," "an awful mess," "grandiose sociological studies and anti-social protest movements." These are the words of Democratic spokesmen for their constituents and to their reactions can be added the detailed article in the May issue of U.S. News & World Report on "The Mess in the Poverty War," a significant poll taken in one of our most populous States, and endless other evidence from public officials and private leaders of all political faiths.

As Senator Dirksen has indicated, we will not be critical only. The Republican minority on the committee has proposed an "Opportunity Crusade"—11 sound and specific recommendations for a total overhaul of the poverty program. They deserve not only a hearing by the Congress and the country—they deserve to be heeded, immediately, by the Johnson-Humphrey Administration.

Therefore, our Question of the Week:

Mr. President, Why Is the War on Poverty Being Lost?

WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS

September 28, 1966

By the Republican Leadership of the Congress:

Speculation increases daily in both Government and public circles that the Johnson-Humphrey Administration is making definite preparations for the imposition of wage and price controls in the near future.

Administration officials are reported as seeing "no way to avoid wage and price controls" in the months ahead. This Administration appears unwilling or unable to stem the high and rising costs of living by the clear and certain means available to it—a drastic cut in non-essential Federal spending. As a result, nationwide alarm at this prospect of wage and price controls is increasing daily.

These questions, therefore, appear to be fair and proper:

1. Mr. President, are you now making preparations for wage and price controls?
2. Mr. President, despite your earlier reported hesitancy about imposing widespread wage and price controls, are you planning to impose them piecemeal?
3. Mr. President, is it true that a special wage-policy review board is already contemplated?
4. Mr. President, if wage and price controls are imposed, will they be imposed "across the board" or will exceptions and exemptions be specified?
5. Mr. President, do you really believe that wage and price controls represent the primary brake on inflation now available?