

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

DECEMBER 13, 1967.—Ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1967

## THE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP OF THE CONGRESS

### FOR THE SENATE

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Leader  
THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Whip  
BOURKE H. HICKENLOOPER, Chairman of  
the Policy Committee  
MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Chairman of the  
Conference  
GEORGE MURPHY, Chairman of the Repub-  
lican Senatorial Committee  
MILTON B. YOUNG, Secretary of the Conference  
HUGH SCOTT, Vice Chairman, Republican  
Senatorial Committee

### FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

GERALD R. FORD, Leader  
LESLIE C. ARENDS, Whip  
MELVIN R. LAIRD, Chairman of the Conference  
JOHN J. RHODES, Chairman of the Policy Com-  
mittee  
H. ALLEN SMITH, Ranking Member, Rules  
Committee  
BOB WILSON, Chairman, Republican Congres-  
sional Committee  
CHARLES E. GOODELL, Chairman, Committee  
on Planning and Research  
RICHARD H. POFF, Secretary of the Conference  
WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Vice Chairman of the  
Conference

### PRESIDING OFFICER

RAY C. BLISS, Republican National Chairman

## FOREWORD

This legislative session marks the seventh year of existence of the Republican Leadership of the Congress as an entity established at the suggestion of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower in January of 1961.

As before, the principal medium of communication from the Leadership to the Congress, the Party and the public is policy statements on subjects of both foreign and domestic significance, the first of these a now annual "Appraisal of the State of the Union" by the Minority Leaders of the House and Senate. These statements have, on 15 regular occasions since January, taken the form of press conference appearances by Senator Dirksen and Representative Ford. In addition, press releases have been issued by the Leadership separately from these conferences.

On January 11, 1965, the Republican Leadership called for the formation of a Republican Coordinating Committee. Since that time, this highly effective organization—composed of General Eisenhower, former presidential candidates Alf Landon, Thomas E. Dewey, Richard Nixon and Barry Goldwater, the Republican Leadership of the Congress, eight governors and representatives of multiple other Republican organizations—has held 11 meetings, maintained 8 task forces and approved and published nationally numerous task force reports. The presiding officer at these meetings is Republican National Committee Chairman, Ray Bliss. The Republican Coordinating Committee continues to be an increasingly positive force in the examination and determination of party policies and party operations.

As in previous years, the Leadership statements for 1967 are being published as a Senate document. They appear on the following pages and are indexed as to the issues covered.

## CONTENTS

	Page
The Budget (February 2, 1967).....	1
Building Bridges (East-West Trade) (May 23, 1967).....	3
Clean Elections (November 16, 1967).....	5
The Cost of Living (September 21, 1967).....	6
"Creative Federalism" (April 20, 1967).....	8
Crime in America (August 29, 1967).....	10
The Farm Problem (March 23, 1967).....	12
Foreign Trade (March 17, 1967).....	13
Housing Bill (April 20, 1967).....	14
Inflation (July 13, 1967).....	15
Law and Order in America (August 3, 1967, October 26, 1967).....	16
Poverty Program (November 3, 1967).....	19
Punto del Este (April 6, 1967).....	20
Revenue Sharing (February 24, 1967).....	21
The State of the Congress (December 7, 1967).....	23
Systems Management (February 28, 1967).....	27

## A RECORD OF PRESS CONFERENCE STATEMENTS

### THE BUDGET

February 2, 1967

By Senator Dirksen:

Every American family knows the meaning of the word "budget". Every American family knows what it is to try to make ends meet—especially these days. Every American family knows that, while it can perhaps for a little while live beyond its means, it cannot do so for very long without finding itself on the short and rocky road to the poor house.

A government—any government—is no exception for a government is, after all, nothing more nor less than a collection of families. Like a family, a government cannot rely on hoped-for income nor can it endure economically for very long if needless expenditures which it can't afford are permitted. I suggest, therefore, that rather than dealing in countless billions of dollars and confusing ourselves with endless strings of zeros, we think hereafter of the operation of this government in family terms.

As has been emphasized already by the news media throughout the country and as has been emphasized already by members of the Congress, this Administration's budget for the coming fiscal year is difficult to comprehend. It contains sums that are astronomical. It contains, to be sure, provision for necessities—especially as regards the fearful conflict in Viet Nam—but it contains also a large number of absolutely non-essential items which, in aggregate, can and should and will be eliminated if the still-heavy Democratic majorities in the Congress will cooperate with us.

The budget of the United States, as submitted to the Congress by the Johnson-Humphrey Administration, is as big as a metropolitan telephone directory and every page contains print just as small. The Republican members of the Congress will, without exception, in the days immediately ahead, be examining every line and item of this budget with clear and knowledgeable eyes. We are determined to vote to retain every item of necessity both in domestic and defense programs but are equally determined, if the Democrat majorities in the Congress can be so persuaded, to eliminate every single item, large, middling or small, that should be cut. Our recommendations in the days ahead will be specific, clear and unmistakable. In this area of non-essential expenditures, we are prepared to wield a swinging meat-cleaver or use a delicate scalpel as the operation may require.

From our school-day reading we have ever more occasion to recall, from Dicken's "David Copperfield," the timeless and timely lesson in budgeteering given young Copperfield by the seasoned and sensible Mr. Micawber:

Annual income twenty pounds, annual expenditure  
nineteen nineteen six, result happiness. Annual income

twenty pounds, annual expenditure twenty pounds ought and six, result misery. The blossom is blighted, the leaf is withered, the God of day goes down upon the dreary scene and you are, in short, flat.

If the Johnson-Humphrey Administration and its still dominant Democrat majorities in the Congress persist in the course they have now mapped out for the American people we too will be "in short, flat." This the Republican members of the Congress will do everything within their minority power to prevent. Let those in the seats of majority and authority be advised.

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

The "Big If" budget of the United States for the coming fiscal year, as presented to this Congress by the Johnson-Humphrey administration, is a bad budget. It should be returned to the President by the Congress immediately, with the demand that it be reviewed and revised into a document that makes sense to the Congress and to the American people.

This budget is misleading. We don't believe in it. The people don't believe in it. At a time when the living costs of every American family have never been higher; at a time when family income just can't keep up; at a time when we are fighting the third largest war in our history; this budget tries to provide for both guns and butter. It actually contains a great deal of lard.

The American people will not tolerate such fiscal manipulation. They will no longer permit such insults to their intelligence and raids on their pocketbooks. The budget is agonizing tabletalk in every American home. The press is already echoing the same angry feeling. One illustration, shown here from a recent column in the Washington Daily News, makes the point dramatically. By any estimate hundreds of dollars will be added to each family's burden.

This budget should be labelled the "Big If" budget. It is the biggest and the "iffiest" in American history:

- if* the Administration's estimate of the cost of Viet Nam is anywhere near accurate;
- if* the Congress votes a postal fee increase;
- if* the Congress approves an income tax increase;
- if* the Congress approves the various tax measures the Administration recommends;
- if* the program cutbacks promised actually occur;
- if* the economy, despite the Administration's manipulations, proves healthy.

We cannot as a people, gamble on so many and such big "ifs."

If a business were operated with a budget like this, it would go bankrupt in a week. If a family budget depended on any such reasoning, the family would be cold, hungry and without a roof almost overnight.

What *must* be done can be done by this Congress to make this bad budget a good one. What *can* be done can be done by the Congress if the Democrat majorities in the Congress will heed the people's demand for economy. The Republican minorities in the Congress are determined to act. Let the Democrat leadership take heed.

## BUILDING BRIDGES AND EAST-WEST TRADE

May 25, 1967

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

Russian guns, Russian bullets, Russian surface-to-air missiles, Russian MIGS, Communist machine guns and Communist mortars continue to kill and maim American fighting men and innocent civilians by the thousands in Viet Nam. Nevertheless, the Johnson-Humphrey Administration continues to urge that we trade with the enemy by "building bridges" between us and these Communist dealers in death.

There may be some who find it wholly consistent that Americans should fight for freedom and survival against Communist aggression on the one hand, while trading and dealing for Communist enrichment on the other. We do not. We will continue to oppose economic aid to an enemy whose global goal is the extinction of freedom.

Trade can be an instrument for world peace but only when applied in the hard-nosed tradition of the Yankee trader, not with the soft-headed hope that it will somehow sway dedicated Communist governments from their stated international goals. The extension of most-favored-nation tariff treatment to Communist East Europe in existing circumstances is unwarranted and unwise.

The reduction of export controls on East-West trade in so-called "non-strategic items" is dangerous, and Congress should carefully review this whole subject. It may well be that present controls should be tightened and certainly they should be more clearly defined by the elected representatives of the people.

Guaranteeing commercial credits to Communist governments is a form of economic foreign aid heretofore reserved for our friends. Such a policy compels our own people, against their will, to encourage and strengthen Communism. It is illogical to do this while committing American lives to a Communist-supported war in Viet Nam.

The May Day order of the day issued by the Soviet Defense Minister, Marshall Andrei Grechko, accused the United States of "hatching sinister plots to spread aggression" in other parts of the world beyond Viet Nam. Anyone who has studied Soviet tactics knows that Moscow always accuses its adversary of doing what the Kremlin itself is plotting to do.

Since last May 1, violence and trouble clearly instigated by Communists have erupted almost on signal in widely scattered parts of the world—in the Sea of Japan, along the 38th parallel in Korea, in Hong Kong, and the Middle East. The open threat of intervention by the Soviet Union to support Nasser's reckless gamble in the Gulf of Aqaba gravely threatens world peace and gives little evidence of any Russian desire for "building bridges" to the Free World.

In my judgment the Soviet bloc has embarked on a bold and concerted effort to divert the attention of the United States and Western Europe from the grim struggle in Southeast Asia at a time when the NATO shield is softer than at any time since it was raised by former Presidents Truman and Eisenhower.

Surely it is no time to woo the Communist world with trade concessions. Let the Soviet Union and Eastern European Communist governments first convince us that they truly seek peace in Viet Nam, the Middle East and elsewhere. Until then we should refuse to be

party to any mercenary deals in which the main advantage is with our avowed enemies.

We will support mutually-beneficial, *really* reciprocal political and economic agreements with Communist governments only when they prove beyond question, as they easily can, that their policies and actions are aimed at lasting peace, honorable settlement of the war in Viet Nam and the crisis in the Middle East, and abandonment of their support for so-called "wars of national liberation" against free and independent peoples.

By Senator Dirksen:

Have you heard of a single Russian, who was reported as a casualty in Viet Nam? You haven't and you won't. What you see reported are American and South Vietnamese casualties. On May 25th, the U.S. Command reported that total American casualties were in excess of 70,000. This included 10,253 dead. South Vietnamese troop deaths exceed 46,000.

Here is the dreadful, current tabulation of our losses:

U.S. deaths:		U.S. wounded:	
Army.....	6, 235	Army.....	37, 327
Navy.....	307	Navy.....	1, 645
Marine.....	3, 370	Marine.....	21, 283
Air Force.....	341	Air Force.....	1, 170
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>10, 253</b>	<b>Total.....</b>	<b>61, 425</b>
Noncombatant.....	2, 058	South Viet Nam deaths...	46, 626

How were they killed? For the most part by Red Russian weapons and Red Chinese weapons in the hands of the Red Viet Cong. It's that simple. And there are more weapons to come.

Our airmen have shot down 71 Russian-built MIGS. It is estimated that another 350 MIGS are available for replacements. Our military reports that 2,450 Russian-built missiles have been fired at our planes. Tens of thousands of Russian-built and Chinese-built rifles and mortars have been found by our troops in the jungles, fields, and Viet Cong supply dumps. The weapons come from the Russians and their wretched Red allies. The victims of these weapons are young Americans and South Vietnamese. The instruments of death are Red-built. The dead, the amputees, the armless, the legless are Americans and South Vietnamese.

These are the people with whom we are asked to set up a partnership to "build bridges." These are the people to whom we are asked to turn the cheek of compassion and embark on a policy of East-West trade. Is trade so sweet and profits so desirable as to be purchased at the price we now pay in death and agony? The volume of trade which might be developed would be a pittance compared with our gross national product. And how durable would such a bridge be when the trade and traffic which flows over it carries the taint of blood?

Whenever the ghastly business in Viet Nam comes to an end and the Reds are prepared to become reliable partners in peace, there will be time enough to talk about "building bridges".

How strange that the Reds are so interested in the American buck that they are ready to venture into the bridge-building business even with Yankee imperialists! We doubt however that the American people are so interested in a few rubles that they are willing to "build bridges"

with American credit, American loans, American machine tools when the death cries from Viet Nam ring daily in their ears.

#### CLEAN ELECTIONS

November 16, 1967

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

In the course of our Appraisal of the State of the Union last January, Senator Dirksen and I said: "Congress must also move ahead on the President's year-old pledge for a Clean Election Law. Such a law must be on the books before 1968."

Recently, the House Republican Policy Committee in a strong, clear statement also urged prompt consideration of clean elections legislation.

We cannot emphasize too strongly the need for passage of legislation of this kind. Immediate action is required of Congress if such reforms are to take effect and be operative during the 1968 campaigns.

It should be emphasized that this effort is genuinely bi-partisan. The several reforms spelled out have been advocated and supported by both the Johnson-Humphrey Administration and the Republican Leadership of the Congress.

It should be emphasized equally that public confidence in the electoral process will suffer seriously if this reform legislation is not enacted into public law.

The bill as originally proposed contained an encouraging number of desirable features. To these, the Republicans in Congress added major provisions of importance and practical value. It is for these reasons that, as the House Republican Policy Committee put it, "• • • we are surprised and dismayed that the Election Reform Bill does not now appear on the Administration's list of *must* legislation."

We hope—very much—that the Johnson-Humphrey Administration and the Democratic majorities in the Congress have lost neither their wish nor their will that clean elections shall become a standard "to which the wise and honest can repair."

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

Why the delay in assuring clean elections?

By Senator Dirksen:

Republicans in the Senate stand firmly beside those in the House of Representatives in their unqualified support of election reform.

Time, as never before, is of the essence if a measure of this kind is to be enacted into law and if its provisions are to be effective in the course of the campaign months just ahead.

Congress cannot ask of other Americans what it is not prepared itself to observe. Unless this Congress is prepared to take this necessary action in campaign reform, it cannot require of others that they toe-the-line in other regards. We must, in short, practice what we preach. We cannot, fairly, urge upon others the conduct of clean elections unless we make very certain that our own house is in order, unless we assure the American people that we are fully and willingly prepared to set rules of conduct for ourselves before we attempt to reform others.

As public office is a public trust, so anything that causes a loss of confidence in the seeking of public office and the conduct of it thereafter produces a steady erosion of faith in our free society.

Needless to say, morality cannot be legislated, ethics cannot be established by law. Political campaigning and political office holding can win public confidence and achieve the people's respect only as the individuals involved set a worthy example to all others.

Periodically, however, circumstances and the questionable practices of a few require review by the many. At such times, helpful legislation can often produce genuine improvement in the campaigning for office and the conduct of public affairs.

We are mystified by the passage of so many months since this bi-partisan legislation was first enthusiastically proposed.

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

Why the delay in assuring clean elections?

### THE COST OF LIVING

September 21, 1967

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

How strange—how very strange it is—that as the cost of food goes up and up, the prices the farmers receive go down and down—to a near-all-time low—6% lower, in fact, than just a year ago!

From among the nation's headlines over the past year-and-a-half: 1966—Mar. 28—"How Big the Price Rise? Is Lid Off?" (U.S. News & World Report).

May 31—"Food Surveys Show Prices Up Nearly 7%" (Washington Star).

Aug. 15—"Food Prices Anger Housewives" (New York Times).

1967—

May 15..... "U.S. Predicts 2-3% Rise in Food Prices" (Washington Star).

May 25..... "Living Costs Keep Climbing" (Christian Science Monitor).

June 5..... "Inflation on the March" (Newsweek).

July 23..... "Still Higher Food Prices Likely, Freeman Says" (Washington Star).

Aug. 8..... "Higher Food Prices Ahead?" (Washington Daily News).

Aug. 17..... "Living Costs Climbing at 3 Per Cent Rate" (Washington Post).

Aug. 28..... "Purchasing Power Lags in U.S. as Costs Rise" (Christian Science Monitor).

Sept. 3..... "Price Rises on Basic Goods Becoming Daily Diet" (New York Times).

Sept. 11..... "Where the Cost of Living Is Heading" (U.S. News & World Report).

Sept. 18..... "Housing Shortage Grows in Suburbs, Raising Prices" (New York Times).

And so it goes—on and on and on—with no real effort being made by the Johnson-Humphrey Administration to stop this rising cost of living.

Sugar is up—household appliances are up—carpeting is up—automobiles are up—clothing is up—and there is no end in sight!

Is there an answer? There is, indeed! But that answer is not, at present, the massive tax increase proposed by this Administration. If, to be sure, the Johnson-Humphrey Administration is unwilling or unable to apply the powerful means it does have at hand—the elimination of non-essential Federal spending—then the American people may have forced upon them by this Administration a crushing tax increase. But the President has *not* made a convincing case for the tax increase he seeks. We shall continue our demand for the elimination of non-essential spending.

We have, however, done far more than just demanded—and this over a period of many months. The Republicans in Congress, with the aid of some enlightened, disenchanted Democrats have already achieved, in the House, a reduction of some 4 billions of dollars in non-essential appropriations. That record is crystal-clear. But more, much more, is required. It will not result, however, until this Administration, with its Democratic majorities in the Congress, responds to the American people's demand that this dreadful pressure of the ever-rising cost of living be removed.

As to where such spending cuts have been made and can be made, I point to the Summary of Action on Budget Estimates by the House of Representatives in this 90th Congress—4 billion dollars worth of largely Republican reductions in the Johnson-Humphrey budget.

Beyond this we insist that the Administration come clean on the *real* cost of the war in Viet Nam. Until this happens, the American people can have no faith whatever in this Administration nor in *their* future. They insist, therefore, upon an end to all *non-essential* spending. This done, they will respond, as always, to what is best and necessary for our nation's safety and well-being.

Therefore, our Question-of-the-Week:

Mr. President: The Cost of Living:

How Much Higher—How Much Longer?

By Senator Dirksen:

Just a year ago this month we were told by the Johnson-Humphrey Administration that what America needed was "a strong dose of self-discipline". To this we replied, as we do now, "Physician, heal thyself". We believed then, as we do now, that to ask self-discipline of labor, to ask self-discipline of management, to ask self-discipline of the farmer, to ask self-discipline of the Congress, to ask self-discipline of the housewife and the consumer was pious and pointless, as it is now—until the President asks self-discipline of his Administration and his own Democratic majorities in the Congress. We were not impressed then. We are not impressed now.

To describe the nation's present economic trend as nightmarish, as several have done, is an understatement. The impact of Federal, state and local taxes has rarely been so great. Interest rates and growing curbs on available credit have seldom been as high or as strong. The jobless rate among the unskilled and minority group workers is dangerously high. The Federal budget deficit anticipated is astronomical. The nation's balance of payments and our growing weakness

in the world market-place are ominous. This Administration's fiscal and monetary policies require drastic overhauling. We Republicans in Congress will do everything in our power to bring it about.

As always, the people who are hurt the most by this sky-rocketing cost of living and economic mismanagement are those who can stand it least—the housewife, the wage-earner, the pensioner, the poor. To the extent that the Republican minority in Congress can do so, we shall put a stop to it.

We are fighting a war on two fronts—one in Viet Nam and one here at home. Both have become critical. The Johnson-Humphrey Administration has regularly lambasted those "tired people" who oppose the so-called "Great Society's" multi-billion dollar programs, insisting that we can fight and win the war in Viet Nam while at the same time we spend even more billions for "Great Society" programs and experiments. We cannot. And if to our voices others are needed to swell the chorus of protest, add that of the respected Democratic Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, Mr. Mills, who insists, with us, that we cannot have both guns and butter.

To those who believe that "Federal money" will solve all our problems, this reminder: there is no such thing as "Federal money". It is *your* money, no one else's. And if you don't believe that, take another look at your last income tax payment. It is the American people's money, siphoned from every home and hearth, that is being spent for the national security—which is right! It is more and more of this same money that is being spent for these "Great Society" experiments and adventures—too many of which are wrong!

A New Direction is called for, as it has been for many long months—toward common sense, prudent management, and a decent respect for the opinions and the dollars of the American people.

Dr. Johnson, Dr. Humphrey—a new examination, a new diagnosis of the nation's economic ills are called for. A strong prescription of economy and truth is needed—now.

Therefore, our Question-of-the-week:

Mr. President: The Cost of Living:

How Much Higher—How Much Longer?

---

#### "CREATIVE FEDERALISM"

April 20, 1967

By Senator Dirksen:

The term "creative Federalism" was expressed in 1962 by a Republican governor, Nelson Rockefeller of New York. It was appropriated by the Johnson-Humphrey Administration and voiced by the President in a speech at Ann Arbor, Michigan in 1964—the same speech in which he first publicly uttered the impressive words, "Great Society." The gap between the Democrat and Republican concepts of "creative Federalism" is as wide as that between the poles.

It was another Democrat president, Woodrow Wilson, who wrote, "The question of the relationship of the states to the Federal government is the cardinal question of our constitutional system." It is indeed!

Unless and until the people and the Congress are given more practical and persuasive evidence of performance-in-partnership with the states by the Federal government, they will continue to view the Johnson-Humphrey concept of "creative Federalism" as nothing but "words, words, words." In this, as in so much else that relates to the credibility of this Administration, we are all from Missouri.

The main feature of this so-called "creative Federalism" appears to be a determination to establish direct Federal-local programs, bypassing the states and their governors and dealing, under Washington-controlled terms, with local authorities. This is neither "creative" nor is it "Federalism." It is instead cremative and is likely to consume us all.

Unless and until the Johnson-Humphrey Administration is prepared to prove the sincerity of its use of the word "partnership," we will be skeptical.

Unless and until the Johnson-Humphrey Administration proves its willingness to cut non-essential Federal spending drastically and so to ease both the Federal and state tax burden on our people, we will be doubtful.

Unless and until the Johnson-Humphrey Administration is prepared to insist that its bureaucrats not only faithfully carry out the wishes of the people's representatives in Congress but, in doing so, cooperate fully and freely with State and local officials, credibility will remain in short supply.

We ask, in short, that the Johnson-Humphrey Administration stop voicing classic cliches. Instead, it should reduce spending. It should share revenues equitably with state and local governments. It should rein in its bureaucrats more tightly. It should release rigid, unnecessary controls.

Instead of *promoting* the "more perfect Union," the Johnson-Humphrey Administration's brand of "creative Federalism" will *impair and imperil* the "more perfect Union."

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

Federal financial assistance to state and local governments has more than doubled since 1960. It has risen from a total of nearly 7 billion dollars per year to nearly 15 billion dollars per year. The end of this "creative Federalism" is not in sight. The President himself has unabashedly predicted an expansion to \$60 billion in 5 years.

The ruthless extension of Federal authority, financing and control grows with every day that passes. With it grows the increased and corrosive dependence of our people on Washington. With it comes a corresponding shrinkage in their self-reliance, their freedom and their funds. "Spend and spend, borrow and borrow, control and control" appears to be a true definition of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration's "creative Federalism." As Senator Dirksen has said, this phrase is nothing thus far but "words, words, words."

We would be in neglect of our duty as the loyal opposition, however, if we were not to admit that there are no rights without responsibilities. This is true for a state and a community as for an individual. The Republicans in Congress will continue to exert every possible effort, despite the Democrat majorities here, to reduce nonessential spending, promote a program of revenue sharing, tax credits, or functional bloc grants to free the energies of state and local governments,

improve bureaucratic practices, eliminate unreasonable Federal controls and restore to our people in their homes, their towns and their cities the rights and the funds of which they are steadily being deprived.

Responsive and responsible state governments are essential to the working of a *truly* creative Federalism. From the 25 Republican governors now in office wonderfully encouraging evidence of this can be seen. No state, however, will deserve freedom from the Johnson-Humphrey Administration's creative Federalism unless it provides the same proof of performance.

We insist, in short, that "creative Federalism" be just that, where Washington is concerned. We expect, at the same time, that our people at home will re-assert their ability to take over in their own best interest. The Republicans in the Congress will continue to set the pace.

---

#### CRIME IN AMERICA

August 29, 1967

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

The War at home—the war against crime—is being lost. The Administration appears to be in full retreat. The homes and the streets of America are no longer safe for our people. This is a frightful situation. Our people will no longer tolerate it. In the past six years the population of the United States has increased by 9% while crime has risen by 62%. The end is not in sight.

The Republicans in Congress *demand* that this Administration take the action required to protect our people in their homes, on the streets, at their jobs. To this end, we have proposed—and vigorously pushed—bills which will provide the Administration with whatever tools it needs to do the job. We will continue to press this Administration and its top-heavy majority in Congress relentlessly, day after day after day. There can be no further Administration excuse for indecision, delay or evasion.

When a Rap Brown and a Stokely Carmichael are allowed to run loose, to threaten law-abiding Americans with injury and death, it's time to slam the door on them and any like them—and slam it hard!

In the 89th Congress, Republican efforts produced—

Reasonable extension and improvement of the Law Enforcement Assistance Act, to assist local and state law enforcement officers;

New thinking regarding means to improve probation and parole service and defeat of Administration efforts to remove supervision of probation officers by Federal judges;

Creation of a Commission to fully revise and reform our Federal criminal laws.

In the 90th Congress, Republican efforts have resulted in—

The rewriting through imperative amendments of the Administration's crime control bill, to further strengthen the hand of state and local governments in crime prevention, detection and prosecution;

Passage by the House of an Anti-Riot Bill, for prosecution of those who use the facilities of interstate commerce with intent to incite a riot;

Passage in the Senate of a bill to strengthen and clarify the review by Courts of Appeal of criminal sentences of Federal courts;

Introduction of a bill, the Criminal Activities Profits Act, to prohibit the use of illegal funds in legitimate business;

Introduction of a bill providing for electronic surveillance control, in order that the right of individual privacy might be fully protected while the national security is equally preserved;

Introduction of an Omnibus Criminal Procedures bill, to strengthen the hand of law enforcement officers and judges;

Introduction of a bill to establish in Congress a Joint Committee on Organized Crime.

These are only a few of the actions already taken by the Republicans in Congress for the protection of our people against organized crime, group violence, and individual crime.

In addition, there has been created a House Republican Task Force on Crime and a Republican Coordinating Committee Task Force on Crime. Each has been hard at work.

Finally, the 25 Republican governors across the nation have activated their "Action Plan," to inaugurate a new era of creative state leadership to meet the national crisis of social injustice and lawlessness.

No one has a right to shout "Fire!" in a theatre. No one has a right to incite riot, looting, destruction and murder. There is no such thing as the right to act against the public safety by any one, anywhere, any time.

Our people are frightened by the rampant crime of all types that is overwhelming the nation. The Congress can, if it follows Republican leadership, provide the tools for fighting crime that the Administration *must* use. We demand that the Congress and the Administration act—now!

By Senator Dirksen:

Not a day passes without hundreds of reports of individual crimes against our people. Not a week passes without evidence of the vicious successes of organized crime from coast to coast. Never in our history have our people been so threatened. Never before has civil discipline been so lax. Never before has leadership been so lacking.

The law *must* be enforced. The law *must* be obeyed. The law *must* be respected. The great failure of our society is its inability to maintain law and order.

Respect for the law is the duty of the people. The enforcement of the law is the responsibility of the Administration. The means it requires for the purpose is the responsibility of the Congress.

We demand that this Congress, with its overwhelming Democratic majority, take immediately the steps we have proposed for Administration use.

We demand also that the Administration—

Apply without further delay the major recommendations of its own, hand-picked Crime Commission;

Cease to restrict our law enforcement officers in their proper use of the investigative tools they have at hand;

Furnish our law enforcement officers with the investigative tools they *still* require and which Republican-proposed legislation would provide;

Establish, as Republicans have long urged, a National Law Enforcement Institute, for research and training in prevention and prosecution of organized and individual crime and for the dissemination of the latest techniques in police science.

Finally, as presented in our Appraisal of the State of the Union in January of this year and earlier, we remind America's judges to uphold the rights of the law-abiding citizen with the same fervor as they uphold the rights of the accused.

By unanimous resolution, the recent Conference of Chief Justices, attended by jurists from 45 states, reasserted this principle and necessity. We applaud their action and commend it without reservation to every judge in the land. The protection of the good citizen is paramount and compelling. I submit that the strengthening of a *good society* is more important than the creation of a so-called "Great Society."

On an earlier day, in his war against an international criminal, a redoubtable Englishman besought the United States to "Give us the tools and we'll finish the job." In this hour, the Republicans in Congress are prepared to provide this Administration with whatever tools it now needs to grind organized and individual crime into the dust that our people might be safe.

We demand that it delay no longer.

We demand that it finish the job.

### THE CRITICAL FARM PROBLEM

March 23, 1967

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

Among the current headlines: "Farmers Vote To Cut Buying"—"Farmers Dismayed by Declining Prices"—"An Angry Rumble From the Farmers"—"Farmers Reported Dumping Milk"—"Farmers Approve Machine Boycott"—"Shooting, Hoarding Mark Dairy Boycott." The American farmer is angry!

The Johnson-Humphrey Administration's inflationary fiscal policies have shot farm production costs sky-high. The American farmer now has his back to the barn wall as never before.

The Johnson-Humphrey Administration's market price manipulations have sharply decreased prices received by farmers. The parity ratio today stands at 74—the lowest since June of 1934—down from last year's 82 and threatening to slide still further from the parity level of 100. As you know the parity ratio is the relationship between prices the farmer receives and the costs he has to meet.

Because of its lack of real concern for the consumer's as well as the farmer's interest, the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has stirred a storm of discontent and resentment on the part of our farmers. Consumers have *not* benefitted accordingly.

Constructively, Republicans in the House and in the Senate have introduced more than fifty farm bills in this new Congress, bills designed first to check and then to remedy the damage done to both the farmer and the consumer by the Johnson-Humphrey cost-price squeeze.

With the farm price of hogs down over 30 per cent in less than a year, with the farm price of eggs down 24 per cent, with the farm price of wheat down 14 per cent, with the farm price of chickens down 11 per cent—and with practically none of these price drops benefitting the consumer—the American people may well ask—as indeed they do—what price the Johnson-Humphrey Administration?

By Senator Dirksen:

Once again, as was true a year ago, the American farmer becomes the victim of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration's double-edged sword: a new record-high in farm operating costs—a near-record low in farm prices—and, we repeat, with no real benefit received by the American consumer.

A major factor in the impact of this double-edged sword is the unwanted and unwarranted flow of agricultural imports into this country. Their depressing effect upon farm prices is severe. It threatens to become far worse. One example: In 1965 this country imported 900 million pounds of milk and dairy products; in 1966 this country imported 2.7 billion pounds of milk and dairy products; this year the figure threatens to reach 4 billion pounds of milk and dairy products. More than half of this deluge of milk imports is coming from the Common Market countries of Europe.

Fifty-seven bills have been introduced by Members of the House and 42 Senators have co-sponsored a bill demanding that such imports be limited. Action by the Johnson-Humphrey Administration in this and every other imperiled area of American agriculture is not only called for but demanded. If agricultural imports continue unchecked at their present rate and volume, our entire agricultural economy is threatened. Our farm surplus is almost gone because of government manipulations and foreign imports. A world food crisis is impending. Our obligations to provide food for the world's needy are increasing annually. It is sheerest folly to impair in any slightest way the efficiency of American agriculture and its incentive and ability to produce food.

As the number and variety of constructive Republican proposals for solution of our several farm programs indicate, there is today no excuse whatever to tolerate the unwillingness or the inability of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration to act—and to act now—in the people's interest. How justified our people are in asking as indeed they do—what price the Johnson-Humphrey Administration?

---

#### FOREIGN TRADE

March 17, 1967

By Senator Dirksen:

The Kennedy Round negotiations at last reach crisis point. Our negotiators in Geneva rightly confess alarm over the magnitude and complexity of the issues still unsolved after nearly three years of effort.

These prolonged negotiations—still fruitless even at this late date—evidence the urgent need for a comprehensive reassessment of America's foreign trade policy by the 90th Congress.

Republicans in Congress strongly favor truly reciprocal trade. But for years the United States has not benefited reciprocally from its

trade agreements. For seven years straight our commercial balance of trade has declined. Its alarming state has been misrepresented to Congress and the nation.

A number of basic domestic industries have suffered grievously under unwisely "liberalized" customs and tariff practices and ineptly administered trade agreements legislation. Foreign-produced goods have prospered in our markets. But foreign markets have not reciprocally responded to our products of America's mines, farms, forests and industry.

We welcome the pledge of Chairman Long of the Senate Finance Committee to conduct an early review of the nation's foreign trade operations and particularly the administration of the trade agreements program. This pledge is in accord with our own earlier recommendations. Our appended statement outlines areas and problems which the national interest requires be included in the Committee's investigation and hearings.

Let the Administration understand clearly the import of these remarks: a simple extension of the present law just will not do. We must proceed—and in good time—to give adequate attention to this nation's basic economic needs, and amend the law accordingly.

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

If this nation's foreign trade position is not to decline further, a first order of business must be the creation of a House Select Committee on Export Controls, a move that has continuously been blocked by the Johnson-Humphrey Administration. This Committee should maintain a continuing evaluation of all related developments, including trade in strategic goods.

We have long recommended urgent solution of our deteriorating balance of payments position—a solution constructive for the rest of the world as well as for ourselves. The problem *must* be solved. In this critical area the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has failed utterly. Like sensible export controls, our balance of payments directly affects jobs for the American people and the health of American industry. We therefore urgently advocate these studies. The studies to which I refer are outlined in our appended statement.

We urge also, in the light of present world conditions, an objective reappraisal of the size and character of America's world-wide military and economic commitments. This recommendation is neither new nor partisan. It is urged by military experts and leaders of both parties. Its urgency is underscored by the sharp disagreement over it among the leaders of the President's party.

The Administration and its Democrat majorities in Congress cannot avoid responsibility for their continuing failure to act decisively on these problems so vital to every American citizen and family.

---

#### HOUSING

April 20, 1967

By the Republican Leadership of the Congress:

Less than an hour ago, as you know, Representative Widnall of New Jersey and Senator Percy of Illinois held a press conference to present their jointly sponsored housing bill, which will be filed in the House and Senate today.

This bill, wholly Republican in origin, is co-sponsored by 50 Republican Representatives and 30 Republican Senators. It offers an original and admirable approach to the solution of one of America's most pressing problems—that of fair, low-cost housing for both urban and rural areas through the application of private enterprise and government resources.

The principles represented by this measure have the full and enthusiastic endorsement of the Republican Leadership of the Congress.

We urge the Democrat Leadership and its majorities in the House and Senate to join us in pressing for the earliest possible consideration and enactment of this vital housing program.

---

#### INFLATION

July 13, 1967

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

The guessing game continues over higher Federal income taxes sought by the Johnson-Humphrey Administration. But meanwhile, there isn't the slightest doubt that we are going to have higher invisible taxes—the silent sales tax on everybody's paycheck and pension which economists call inflation.

Now we hear about an 8% instead of a 6% income tax surcharge. Under the steady escalation of consumer prices over the past year a family of four earning \$10,000 already has paid an invisible tax three times the surcharge. Most housewives realize this—even if the bureaucrats do not!

The most recent official Price Index figures, those for the month of May, reveal the sharpest increase since last year. The Labor Department's own Bureau of Labor Statistics sees no likelihood of relief in the months to come. The chief of that Bureau predicts an additional two and one-half per cent price increase before long.

Does the Johnson-Humphrey Administration know what is happening to us? Does the Johnson-Humphrey Administration care? Does the Johnson-Humphrey Administration plan to take the steps necessary to protect the American people from these rapidly rising living costs, which will cancel out any wage increases, drain family budgets and shrink the pensions of the aging even further?

Mr. Ackley, the President's chief economic advisor, sees as solutions only a tax increase or what he calls "responsible use of private wage and price restraint." On the latter point, Mr. Ackley appears to be an economic wonderland.

The Johnson-Humphrey Administration incredibly refuses even to test-fire the best weapon for fighting inflation it holds in its hands, common-sense cutting and prudent postponement of non-essential Federal spending. To this Administration, more domestic spending is the sure cure for everything, including its setbacks in last November's elections.

Higher inflation is here. Are higher income taxes just around the corner?

Therefore, our Question of the Week:

Mr. President: More Inflation—More Debt—What Next?

By Senator Dirksen:

To spend beyond income means to go into debt. To go into debt means to borrow. To borrow means to add to the money supply. To increase the money supply means to add to the cost of goods and services. There is but one real answer—to keep spending within income—to live within our national means.

Very closely related to ballooning inflation is the national debt, which has now risen, with the approval of this Democrat-controlled Congress, to 326 billions. To call it the national debt is accurate. Equally accurate and much clearer is its right name—the public debt—for this is without any question whatsoever a debt the American public owes and, one day, must pay.

Next time you walk into a bank, take from the display rack at the counter a copy of that bank's balance sheet and statement of condition. You will immediately find listed among its principal items, "U.S. Government Bonds." How did the banks acquire these U.S. Government Bonds? They did it with the money deposited with them by you and by me! Make no mistake about it—*you and I*, American citizens all, owe this incredible public debt!

The interest alone on this debt will soon be more than 14 billions. You and I—the owners of the public debt—will be paying over a billion dollars per month in interest on it for years and years to come. Can you picture our grandchildren facing this debt, which *they* too will have to pay?

Unless and until the Johnson-Humphrey Administration is brought up short by the American people, inflation will stop creeping and will begin galloping!

Therefore, our Question of the Week:

Mr. President: More inflation—More Debt—What Next?

---

### LAW AND ORDER IN AMERICA

August 3, 1967

By Senator Dirksen:

No person has a right to act against the public safety, anywhere, any time. There is no excuse—ever—for riot, arson and murder. On this Americans are agreed.

Americans also agree that—

When near-anarchy exists in this nation—

When trouble-makers defy the law, incite rioting, burning, pillaging and murder—

There must be action. Its urgency is extreme.

Punishment of those who break the law must be swift and decisive—no matter who they may be.

The protection of life and property must be primary and total.

The re-enforcement of every arm of the law everywhere must be maximum. There can be no compromise with crime—and crime is exactly what this is.

Republicans in Congress and across America call for firm, certain action at all levels and in total strength.

Explanations for this war in America's streets are many. Some may be well-founded. Others are not. To find the right answers is our first duty.

The Administration has named a "blue ribbon" commission to work to this end. This is not enough—not nearly enough. Congress itself must act to determine promptly the causes and the cures of this frightful situation. The Congress—for the people—must provide the solutions. Our people *must* be made safe in their homes, at their jobs and on the streets.

Mr. Ford and I, with many of our colleagues, have filed a resolution calling for immediate creation of a Joint Committee of the Congress to investigate riots and violent civil disorder, with full powers necessary to this purpose.

Additional measures having similar objectives have been filed by others in Congress. The Government Operations Committee of the Senate may be named to take initial investigative action. Whatever is done must be done promptly, without partisanship. We are all in this boat together and the winds are raging.

We repeat, punishment must be swift for those who break the law—whichever they may be. There must be *no* reward for those who riot and destroy.

*But—*

There *must* be found workable solutions to this unrest and violence that will permanently assure eradication of these evils.

There *must* be achieved a restoration of that strength-in-unity that has made America great and will keep America free.

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

The statements just made by Senator Dirksen have my complete and wholehearted support.

This war in our streets *must* be brought to the earliest possible end for the safety and benefit of every American citizen.

I am wholly confident that the Congress and, hopefully, the Administration, will promptly and accurately determine the root causes and enduring cures for this malignant social cancer.

The Republican Leadership of the Congress believes that there are immediate steps to be taken by all of us—now. In our January appraisal of the State of the Union we urged several of these:

A total re-vamping and re-direction of the Poverty War—where waste has been astronomical and administration ineffective. We said then and we repeat:

We want an Opportunity Crusade that will enlist private enterprise and the States as effective partners of the Federal Government in this fight. We would give the children of poverty the very highest priority they deserve. As Republicans have urged for two years, Head Start requires follow-through in the early grades.

Creation of a new Industry Youth Corps "to provide private productive employment and training on the job."

The passage of a Human Investment Act "to induce employers to expand job opportunities for the unskilled."

The enlargement of "opportunities of low-income Americans for private home ownership."

Support for a system of tax sharing to return to the States and local governments a fixed percentage of personal income taxes without Federal control.

The elimination of the poverty of realistic ideas among Poverty War officials.

We believe that in vastly expanded educational opportunities and productive job training the earliest and best of these solutions will be found. A closer application of Federal resources to local needs is clearly necessary.

In help—in self-help—for this generation of Americans, in help—and opportunity—for the next generation—we will find the answers we seek and must have.

October 26, 1967

#### By the Republican Leadership of the Congress:

The demonstrations that have taken place in Washington and across the nation in recent months have given the American people increasing and even frightening concern for the future. We share that concern, since never before in our history has lack of confidence in America's leadership been so evident.

We believe, very strongly, that the hour has now passed when firmness must continue to yield to tolerance in dealing with these violent few. They are unwilling to demonstrate peacefully. They are unwilling to debate without violence. They are permitted, nevertheless, to disturb the public peace, to endanger their fellow-citizens in their lives and property, and to undermine the very well-being of the nation itself by giving aid and comfort to our enemies.

We are well aware, as all Americans must be, of the Constitutional rights of freedom of speech and *peaceable* assembly which are so great a part of our treasured heritage. We are equally aware, however, that there is no right to act against the public safety by anyone, anywhere, any time—for any reason.

This nation had its origin in dissent. We have always believed in unlimited criticism—in time of war and in time of peace. Free speech—without violence—must always be permitted and approved. But law-breaking and violence can *never* be condoned. Our country has prospered and survived as a democracy, in great part through *peaceful*, even if at times heated, discussion among men of good-will. Its future will be equally dependent upon the maintenance of this great tradition.

It is our conviction that it is the malcontent, the misguided and, yes, the malicious, who form the greatest part of these demonstrations. Fortunately, they represent only a very small fraction of our population. That there may be many others who share their views on particular issues is very possible. But it is these, and these alone, who see fit to breach the public peace, break the nation's laws, defy established authority, and destroy public property.

These wretched few can no longer be tolerated. They must be held in check hereafter and, when necessary, be brought to justice, legally but firmly by the scruff of their collective necks. The safety and the peace of mind of all decent, hard-working, law-abiding millions of other Americans must be preserved.

The first duty of those in authority—in Washington and in every community throughout the land—is the preservation of public order

and the firm enforcement of the law. The rights and the privileges of those countless millions of good Americans who obey the law and keep the peace *must* be given priority above all others, at all times. Tolerance of marchers and demonstrators is all very well—up to the point at which they defy the law and endanger the public safety. We call upon those in authority everywhere to enforce the law, with our full backing, in the *public* interest. We urge them to do so without undue concern hereafter as to the protests and whinings of these law-breakers, who have no regard whatever for the good of the community and who in our view, seek only publicity and selfish personal privilege.

We repeat, there is no right to act against the public safety by anyone, anywhere, any time—for any reason.

It is the conviction of the Republican Leadership of the Congress—and, we believe, of all good Americans everywhere—that the law *must* be enforced and the safety of our people preserved. We pledge our utmost efforts to this end.

---

### POVERTY PROGRAM

November 3, 1967

By Senator Dirksen:

Contrary to the belief of some—particularly in the Johnson-Humphrey Administration—the endless spending of the American people's money is *not* the only answer to our many critical problems.

Only when common-sense—old-fashioned horse sense—is combined with prudent planning and calm, clear direction of Federal and State and local programs can we expect maximum results at minimum cost.

This has never been more painfully and expensively illustrated than in the waging of this alleged poverty war by the Administration's Office of Economic Opportunity, where politics takes priority over the poor.

Money alone—no matter how many tons of it—won't do the job. Only as this program is thoroughly overhauled legislatively and re-directed from top to bottom can we look for satisfactory results from it.

Neither the Senate nor the House have thus far done much more than tinker with the poverty problem. Only as those recommendations to be made by Republicans on the House Floor next week are adopted can we hope for a return to sanity and efficiency in this multi-million dollar effort.

The Democratic leadership in Congress remains reluctant to help us take these necessary steps in all our people's interest—especially that of the poor, who will benefit most.

Nevertheless, we shall do *our* best to help win the poverty war—in the Nation's best interest. We hope—very much—that every like-minded American, in and out of Congress, will stand up and be counted with us. Let us hear from you—loud and clear.

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

The Johnson-Humphrey Administration's poverty war was proclaimed with noble objectives—objectives which all good Americans have *always* shared. But it has been tragically weak, wasteful and ineffective in achieving those objectives.

Some of its programs—such as Head Start—have been worthwhile and deserve continuance. Too many others—such as the Job Corps—have, from the beginning, been woefully misdirected and very badly administered.

The Republicans in Congress are trying—as they have been for months—to correct the evils the so-called poverty war has spawned. We are working hard to prevent, in the months ahead, the reckless waste of millions of the taxpayers' dollars that has characterized this "war" from the start.

Next week, with new legislation to be offered on the Floor of the House, we Republicans will make yet another attempt to salvage the good in the poverty program and wholly eliminate the bad. Far better job training—more job opportunities—greatly improved educational programs—the full participation of private enterprise—greater state responsibility and direction. These are fundamental. These we will insist upon.

Present indications are that we will not have the support of the Democratic leadership in this constructive endeavor. They seem determined to maintain this program as it is—regardless of its weaknesses, regardless of its record of poor and top-heavy, national administration, regardless of its incredible waste of the American people's money and its failure to help the poor in any substantial way.

We Republicans, therefore, appeal to every American citizen to enlist in the fight to solve this problem by re-shaping and re-directing this massive endeavor. Wire, write or telephone your Representatives in Congress to take these firm, practical, prudent steps—now—to make of this poverty war something more than a terrible expensive exercise in marching up one hill and down another—endlessly—at the expense of and not for the benefit of the poor.

---

#### PUNTA DEL ESTE

*April 6, 1967*

By the Republican Leadership of the Congress:

Next week the President of the United States will journey to Punta del Este, Uruguay, for a "summit" meeting of the Organization of American States. His announced objective will be to encourage and help stimulate further meaningful action by our Latin American neighbors toward economic and educational development and political stability.

We support programs of active cooperation with the peoples of Latin America. We recognize the need for cooperation now and in the future and also the need for United States assistance to be accompanied by self-help and self-initiative and effective community action by the recipients. We wish the President Godspeed and success in his mission.

We call your attention also to the statement on Latin America by the Republican National Coordinating Committee to be released Friday, April 7, 1967.

## REVENUE SHARING

February 24, 1967

By Senator Dirksen:

For more than three decades now, since the onset of the New Deal, our Federal system, upon which this nation was founded and because of which it has grown strong, has been steadily eroding, despite the strenuous efforts of the Eisenhower Administration to prevent it. This erosion, which had its origin in those days has now grown to the point where, with excessive concentration of power and control in National Government hands, the destruction of our Federal system could be imminent.

As the National Government has, increasingly, become the source of near-absolute authority, the principal collector and spender of the people's money, and a central point of control over much of our lives, the position and the strength of the individual states has been steadily undermined and enfeebled.

Because we fear this destruction of the Federal system and because we are so determined to prevent it, we urge again, as we did in our Appraisal of the State of the Union in January, that there be instituted and established by this 90th Congress some principle for the sharing of tax revenues or for tax credits between the National Government and the individual States. By such means, among others, we believe that the erosion of our Federal system can be arrested, that strangling National Government controls can be loosened and the rights and responsibilities of our people in our states and local communities can be restored.

The principal device through which National Government power and control over the states has become established has been through the torrent of Washington largesse and regulation known as "grants-in-aid." The chart shown here today illustrates in simple and fearful form the speed with which this Federal club over the states and local communities has grown in a shockingly short period of time. The hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations reveal that a projection of this chart would indicate a grants-in-aid total in excess of 50 billion dollars by 1975. Current examples of this are legion:

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare alone has published a book containing some 527 pages. It is entitled "Grants-in-aid and Other Financial Assistance Programs Administered by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare." This 527-page book merely lists and describes briefly the grants-in-aid programs administered by this *single* department of the Federal Government.

The Office of Economic Opportunity—the War on Poverty headquarters—has published a book entitled "Catalog of Federal Programs for Individual and Community Improvement." The book is 414 pages long.

Very recently the Office of Education prepared a *single* table for the use of Congressional offices. This table outlines the programs available from this bureau alone. There are 112 separate grant-in-aid categories in this table.

It might be noted also that the most recent edition of "The Encyclopedia of United States Government Benefits", a volume of 1,010 pages lists more than 8,000 Federal Government aid items.

Those in bureaucratic authority proudly refer to this as "Creative Federalism."

It ought to be called "Cremative Federalism," likely to consume us all.

To these illustrations many others can and will be added by the Republicans in Congress as we urge the Democrat leadership and majority to schedule legislative hearings on this now vital subject of sharing of tax revenues between the Federal Government and the 50 states and local communities.

Let me emphasize—just as strongly as I can—that we do not believe such a policy and program to be ideal by any means. The truly ideal form of tax revenue sharing would consist of a reduction in Federal spending and in Federal taxes, tax reform, and a selective phasing-out of some Federal grants-in-aid. We face, however, a reality and not an ideal. We confront a fact and not a theory. We therefore urge—no, we demand—that this next best approach be made—and be made now—by this Congress and by the prompt action of the Democrat leadership and majority in scheduling public and thorough hearings on this important matter.

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

Let me repeat and emphasize the vital point Senator Dirksen has just made—that we believe the truly ideal form of tax revenue sharing between the Federal Government and the states would consist of a reduction in Federal spending and in Federal taxes, tax reform, and a selective phasing-out of some Federal grants-in-aid. Only by this means can we truly hope to restore the Federal system to strength and balance. Only in this way can we restore to our people in the states and their local communities the rights of decision, historically theirs, to solve far more effectively than can be done from Washington the problems they know best.

Let me emphasize also that we do not now endorse any particular plan for tax revenue sharing that has been offered to date. In the 89th Congress 53 bills on this subject were filed, from both sides of the aisle. In the 90th Congress, again more than 50 bills have been filed thus far from both sides of the aisle. Governors, mayors, county supervisors and other public leaders have made specific recommendations. Economists and leaders from the academic community have done likewise. By thorough and extended public hearings and through the established legislative process we can achieve the best possible tax revenue sharing plan. We now demand, therefore, that the Democrat leadership and majority move promptly to schedule such hearings.

We are aware of the several important factors which must be taken into account in the preparation of a sound tax revenue sharing plan. We realize that allocation of tax revenues to the states might be done on any one of several bases, that those states with smaller population and modest state revenues must be individually provided for, that the authority of the governors of our states must be respected, that the revenue-raising responsibilities of the states must be re-inforced, that tax credit proposals must be carefully weighed, that the needs of our urban centers and the seasoned opinions of their mayors must be taken into full account. These are but a few of the necessary considerations that must be given this proposal. No one of them can be treated lightly nor can any thoughtful opinion be left unheeded.

The most recent Gallup poll reveals that 70 percent of our people endorse the finding of a sound tax revenue sharing plan. The voice of the people is being heard—loud and clear. Our people resent fiscal plenty at the Federal level and fiscal poverty in their communities. They resent the labelling of Federal tax money as “free money”, for they know every penny and dollar, comes from their own pockets. They resent and will no longer accept remote, arbitrary dictation from Washington. Local officials know best how to solve the problems with which they live each day.

#### THE STATE OF THE CONGRESS

*December 7, 1967*

By Senator Dirksen:

In our Appraisal of the State of the Union last January, Mr. Ford and I, speaking on behalf of the Republicans in Congress, assessed the situation in which we as a people then found ourselves, both at home and abroad. We refused, in concluding that assessment, to be dismayed or to despair. This, despite great provocation by this Administration since, we refuse to do now.

The sole objective of the Republicans in Congress in these past months, as over the years, has been the very best interests of all of the American people, at all times and on every issue. To help achieve those best interests we have had historic demands made upon us as the party of loyal opposition—historic because we have been faced with certain problems unparalleled in the nation's annals, demands because they have compelled us from time to time to make harsh and unpleasant judgments and decisions in order that those best interests might be fully served and fully protected.

Most importantly, we have given unhesitating support to every requirement and need of our fighting forces in Southeast Asia and our armed services elsewhere in the world. This we will continue to do, however heavy the burden. Americans prepared to give their lives in conflict must be given by us every single item of weaponry and other support they may at any moment need—and they will be.

The conduct of the conflict in Viet Nam is, as under our Constitution it must be, the full responsibility of the President in his capacity as Commander-in-Chief. Only he has the authority, only he has the duty, only he has the full information available for the execution of that responsibility. The decisions made and to be made can and must be made by him and him alone.

In order, however, that his hand may be guided and strengthened in this, it is imperative that the most thoughtful discussion possible continue in the Congress and among our people to this end. Let it be emphasized anew, nevertheless, that as we search together for a solution to Viet Nam we demonstrate our unity of purpose by conducting such discussion in a fully free but a wholly orderly manner. Dissent is one thing; disagreement by violence is quite another. Dissent we encourage and approve. Violence, in any form and for whatever purpose, we condemn, now and hereafter.

We urge again that this Administration—to a degree and with a vigor not yet evident—look beyond Viet Nam and consider where we shall stand and with whom we shall sit when this conflict ceases. The Congress and the people have seen all too little evidence of genuine

effort to explore and exploit the diplomatic opportunities available to us in this regard. Channels of diplomacy, economic and otherwise, still remain open for our use.

The Republicans in Congress have not been concerned alone with the war in Viet Nam. Other aspects of our foreign policy have been given equally sharp scrutiny. We have not hesitated to recommend or to implore an immediate re-shaping of it, whenever and wherever we have believed it necessary in the nation's interest.

In the Middle East—a tinderbox of appalling nature—Republicans have hoped for months for the adoption by the Administration of the atomic desalinization plan placed before it some time ago by Americans of unquestioned ability and patriotic purpose. We are now informed by the Department of State that this extraordinary project—which might well change the entire atmosphere in the eastern Mediterranean—is “not politically feasible”. This we cannot believe. The proposal represents a thoughtful, practical instrument for peace without parallel in recent years. It might well provide the means of achieving political and economic stability in the Middle East. As Americans, we urge the retrieval and adoption of that proposal and its implementation at the earliest possible time.

In the American people's interest, we have continued to hold the line against a unilateral “building of bridges” with the Communist nations of the world. It is neither sensible nor safe to strengthen in the slightest degree the hand of an enemy which is at this moment striking down young Americans in Viet Nam—and in every corner of the globe conspiring actively for the destruction of free America. Where and when, in the Senate as in the House, we have taken this stand, we have done so for this reason and no other. If, in the months to come, we should be given good and convincing reason to expect otherwise of the Communists, we shall be pleased indeed to reassess our own thinking in this somber regard.

The State of the Congress today is one of vexation and deep-seated concern as we look about us here at home. We see an Administration wholly blind in its belief that the enormous costs of the war in Viet Nam can and will be borne by our people while at the same time the Administration seeks unrestrained license to promote and finance multi-billion dollar social programs. These have in too many instances proved valueless or dangerous or both. Yet we are asked to support more and more such projects stamped out in the same socialistic mint.

At this very moment the international air is filled with conversation and concern regarding the “defense of the dollar” now that the British pound has been devalued. The record is crystal-clear that the socialistic experiments and experience of Great Britain in recent years have been the primary reason for the near collapse of her economy. A continuation and multiplication of the so-called Great Society's experiments could bring identical results here. Socialism and a sound economy simply will not mix. Despite our nation's enormous resources *our* economy cannot long stand such abuse.

Let me make it quite clear, as we have done repeatedly, that ours is not and has not been opposition for its own sake. The legislative record in both the Senate and the House is studded with Republican proposals for meeting our urban and other domestic needs, proposals which have found their counterparts in the programs of Republican Governors from coast to coast. The Congressional Record and the

nation's news media have documented these regularly. Mr. Ford and the House Republican Policy Committee have recently provided the press and the public with a detailed and comprehensive review of House Republican accomplishments thus far in this session of the Congress. I shall, within a few days, present an equally thorough report of the efforts and achievements of the Republicans in the Senate.

In summary, we Republicans in Congress have directed our efforts at home and abroad to making the most of our people's tax dollars in the achieving of maximum defense and sound economic progress. The mere spending of additional billions—which seems to be this Administration's only talent—will not, without sound economic planning, fully competent management and plain, old-fashioned horse sense, solve the fearful problems we face. Such a policy can achieve nothing but a total erosion of our people's confidence in their leadership and of their faith in our country's future.

In the months ahead, as in these months past, the Republicans in the Senate as in the House, will continue to hew to these policies and principles, convinced that the elections of 1966 gave us just this mandate, confident that the elections of 1968 will confirm it.

In the words of a latter-day Englishman, not of the socialistic breed: "Give us the tools and we'll finish the job."

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

New direction—new ideas—new vigor. These the Republican Minority in the House have contributed in marked degree in this first session of the 90th Congress. Our chief interest and concern has been not only the best possible defense of the nation, the full support of our fighting forces in Southeast Asia and the cutting-back of reckless, wasteful nonessential Federal expenditure. Our equal interest and concern has been what lies ahead of us as a people—what course our government will take—or be forced to take—in the years immediately ahead.

Last January, in offering my domestic Appraisal of the State of the Union, I listed, on behalf of the Republicans in the House, 40 specific recommendations for action. These were not merely alternatives to proposals made by others. They were, in greater part, specific program proposals, 30 of these were purely domestic in nature; 10 related to our national defense. As of this date, in the House, we have made visible and heartening progress with 24 of these. This has resulted in great part from 96% Republican solidarity on roll call votes in support of House Policy Committee positions. As a Minority, we consider this a good record and we intend to improve upon it in the months ahead.

The heart and core of our united Republican effort has been the sharp cutting-back of Federal expenditures for non-essential purposes. Our position in this has not changed. And we are not convinced by belated promises of this Administration to take action in this direction. Our original and continuing position was and is that Federal expenditures should be reduced not less than 5 billion dollars in this fiscal year. We know that it can be done, if the Administration truly wishes it.

In the course of these debt-propelled Sixties, Federal spending has run wild. This Administration has shown no concern whatever as to the crushing burden its socialistic policies and programs have placed upon our people. And for this Administration to use the war in Viet Nam

as an excuse is unfair and unworthy. While defense spending has risen by 68% since 1960, non-defense spending has increased 97%—from 48.6 billion in fiscal 1960 to an estimated 95.6 billion for fiscal 1968.

Let it be recorded here and now—as on many occasions past—that we Republicans are more than willing, indeed anxious, to provide for Americans in need at home to the full extent that the nation's resources and economy make it prudently possible. To us, the word "prudently" means simply: with a decent, common sense regard for what we and our children and their children can afford. The economic chaos which this Administration's policies and practices now threaten to produce will undermine and destroy America just as surely as will our enemies at home and abroad, if permitted to do so.

Consistent, in the American tradition, with our stand against government waste and extravagance has been our effort, encouragingly successful in this Congress, to transfer some measure of responsibility and control of the people's affairs from Washington to our states and communities. We are greatly heartened by our success, even though a Minority, in shifting a sizeable number of the so-called Great Society's programs away from the Federal bureaucracies and their categorical grants to our state and local officials through the Republican system of block grants. These make it possible for those at home, who know the problems best, to solve them with greatest speed and effect. The Comprehensive Health Act, the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act, the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Air Quality Act and the Meat Inspection Act, in their final House versions, provide concrete examples of this new direction and approach.

Last Monday, the House Republican Policy Committee published a detailed and comprehensive documentation of these House Republican accomplishments. I commend that release to your attention and review, now and in the months to come.

In 1966, the American people strengthened the Republican Minority in the House with unmistakable emphasis. We interpreted those results as a mandate to put a check-rein on this willful, wasteful Administration, to review and, where desirable, to modify its run-away programs and projects and to initiate proposals of our own that would restore sense and balance to public service. We believe our record to date represents a faithful response to that mandate for new direction—new ideas—new vigor. If, as I am confident we will, we continue to produce the Republican solidarity and good sense on major legislative items that we have thus far, we shall have done the American people a signal service and they will know it. Knowing it, they will, we feel certain, add to our Republican strength by their action at the polls next year.

In summary, our objectives and our accomplishments thus far in this Congress have been these:

- (1) Full support of our armed services in Southeast Asia and elsewhere throughout the world;
- (2) Insistence that this Administration, to the extent that it may still be able to do so, succeed in Viet Nam or be prepared to yield to a Republican Administration whose new direction, new ideas and new vigor might well offer our people and the world a more probable prospect of peace;

(3) Insistence upon the immediate establishment of a bipartisan, blue ribbon commission of America's best experts to re-examine our short and long range defense posture in this time of national peril;

(4) To bring about a substantial reduction in non-essential Federal spending and to insist upon even greater reduction—an objective in which we have the full and encouraging support of the distinguished Democratic Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee;

(5) To demand that this Administration's abuse of the American farmer cease and cease now—and that its inflation-blind indifference to the American consumer come to an abrupt halt;

(6) To resist, until such satisfactory further reductions have been written into law, the Administration's proposed tax increase;

(7) To demand of this Administration whole-hearted backing of the initiative already taken by Republicans in Congress to make our streets and homes safe for our people;

(8) The continuing transfer of governmental authority, responsibility and control from Washington to the states and individual communities by the system of block grants already successfully initiated in a number of legislative areas;

(9) More and more to establish active, practical, effective co-operation between government and the private sector, as in the Republican-initiated Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 and the Republican-proposed Human Investment Act of 1967;

(10) To continue to urge the reorganization and reform of the Congress, in order that it might better and more swiftly serve the needs of the American people and beyond this to assure by next year clean and orderly elections for all Federal offices.

The record of this Democratic-controlled Congress to date is far from impressive. Where it has succeeded in meeting our people's basic needs, it has done so in greatest part through Minority solidarity and singleness of purpose.

Our people deserve an effective, productive Congress. Republicans are determined they shall have it. We are fully prepared to do everything in our power to meet our people's fundamental needs—in defense and in human well-being. In so doing, we are resolved to maintain that national economic good health required to *guarantee* the continuance of such services to ourselves and our posterity.

---

#### SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT

February 28, 1967

By the Republican Leadership of the Congress:

Forty Republican members of the House of Representatives and 16 Republican members of the Senate have introduced legislation for the establishment of a National Commission on Public Management. We urge the Democrat leadership and majority to schedule hearings *promptly* on this significant measure.

This Commission would bring to bear on the management of public business the very best minds in private industry, Government, labor, and education. Its mandate is to answer two fundamental questions:

How can new management technology aid us in solving governmental problems? What is the best way to take advantage of the opportunities these new techniques provide?

Examples of attempts to apply these modern management principles to State and local affairs already exist. In November 1964, the State of California announced its plan for the application of systems engineering techniques to four important public problems. New York State is currently developing a computer-based identification and intelligence system for law enforcement, the first of its kind in the world.

Congress has over the past decade enacted a host of creative programs designed to solve our public, social, and economic problems. We have made important strides forward in education, health care, pollution control and urban development, but the dimensions of our remaining problems are staggering: 10,000 of our Nation's communities will face serious problems of air pollution; the demand for water consumption may exceed the available supply before the end of this century; there are 9 million substandard housing units in the United States, most of them in urban areas; traffic jams cost the Nation over \$5 billion each year; and scientific and technical information is doubling every 15 years.

It is clear that problems of this magnitude are not susceptible to the traditional solutions. We must reach beyond our history for new ways to manage the public business effectively and economically.

We are sure that none of us can forecast the full measure of worth to this Nation which such an endeavor may ultimately provide. We are equally certain that the use of modern technology coupled with the application of modern management techniques may provide solutions to many of the problems which now appear insoluble. It is up to us in the Congress to insure that these steps are taken in a timely fashion, hence, our urging of prompt hearings on this measure.

