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The long legislative year just completed—the longest since 1942—marks the third year of operation by the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership since it was created in January 1961 at the suggestion of President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The broadest policy matters, both domestic and international, were under constant surveillance and, of course, resulted in the wide range of policy statements recorded on the pages which follow. As has been customary, most of the statements were presented on behalf of the Joint Leadership by Senator Dirksen and Representative Halleck, but on appropriate occasions this procedure was varied by issuance of Leadership releases without an accompanying press conference.

The Joint Leadership was broadened this year by increasing the group from 9 members to 11. The Chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee, Senator Thruston B. Morton of Kentucky, and the chairman of the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee, Representative Bob Wilson of California, joined the Leadership, thus rounding out an operation which is presided over by the chairman of the Republican National Committee, Representative William E. Miller of New York.

Following precedent, the views of other party leaders and experts were frequently sought, and in several instances these guests were asked to participate in press conferences which followed Leadership meetings. Their press conference statements are, of course, also included in this document.
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A RECORD OF PRESS CONFERENCE STATEMENTS

March 19, 1963

By Senator Dirksen

The Kennedy administration’s highly questionable proposal to increase the national debt so that the Federal Government can spend more while the people pay less in taxes offers so many dangers to our economy that it is difficult to list them.

Certainly one of the greatest dangers is further inflation which means rising prices. The American people, who saw their money cheapened by nearly 50 percent under the Truman administration, understand this danger and it is one of the reasons they doubt the wisdom of President Kennedy’s proposal to increase spending while cutting taxes.

But there is a much less understood danger—the threat the President’s program presents to an already bad economic problem, the flow of gold from this country to foreign lands.

In 1962, the United States paid to foreign creditors $2.2 billion more than it received in the balance of payments and it is already estimated our deficit position will be equally bad this year. As a result of the 1962 payments, our shrinking gold holdings were reduced $911 million, meaning our foreign creditors demanded gold instead of accepting our dollars more than 40 percent of the time.

It is a fact of economic life that the demand for gold by foreign holders of dollars will step up sharply if the Kennedy program should result in additional inflation. Foreign economists and financiers recognize the inflation potential in the proposed Kennedy deficit and just their fear of it could produce increased difficulties in our flow-of-gold problem.

We, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, feel it imperative to point out that higher prices which inevitably follow inflation could only mean less export of American goods and more export of gold to pay for the increased imports of goods made by cheaper foreign labor. Instead of helping solve unemployment, Mr. Kennedy’s planned deficit very conceivably could increase unemployment and worsen our gold position to boot.

The creation of jobs is our No. 1 problem and we believe any program which weakens confidence is likely to aggravate rather than solve the problem.
August 22, 1963

By Senator Dirksen

For many months we, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, have been fighting to get the red ink out of President Kennedy's ever-increasing budgets.

We have argued that if taxes are to be cut, then Government spending must be cut also; that if the United States is to stop the drain on its gold supply resulting from an unfavorable balance of payments with other nations, then a sane fiscal policy at home is more important than ever.

The plain truth is that the Federal Government is not in a wholesome financial position today. The latest evidence of this is the fact that our balance of payments deficit has now reached in the second quarter an annual rate of $5.2 billion.

What this means is that Americans, including the Federal Government, have been spending, lending, and investing at a higher rate abroad than foreigners have in the United States. And it introduces a more serious problem: the probability of heavier demands for payment in gold by our creditors abroad.

A foreign creditor is willing to hold our dollars instead of demanding gold so long as he sees nothing occurring that might impair the value of those dollars. But when he sees the parade of Kennedy deficits totaling more than $20 billion since 1961, a foreign creditor worries about the inflation potential and he demands gold to play safe. And our gold reserves continue to dwindle.

Exactly like the foreign creditor, plain, ordinary Americans are worried about the value of the dollar also. They have painful memories of the inflationary Truman years when the value of the dollar was reduced almost 50 percent. That's why the Gallup poll has shown the overwhelming majority of the American people don't want a tax cut if it means increasing the national debt.

We say the Kennedy administration is engaging in dangerous economic brinkmanship. This Nation cannot long sustain higher and higher Federal spending, more and more debt, greater and greater interest payments, and less and less amounts in our gold reserves.

Mr. Kennedy continues to recommend every economic device but the right one—a real effort to reduce Federal spending to levels we can afford. There is nothing new or fancy about it, but it has worked for centuries.

Basic Issues

July 1, 1963

By the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership

In 1960, when the voters of this country elected John F. Kennedy to be President of the United States and gave him a 2 to 1 Democratic majority in the U.S. Senate and a 3 to 2 Democratic majority in the House of Representatives, certainly they had every right to expect that Mr. Kennedy would live up to his promises, especially with such overwhelming Democratic majorities in both branches of the Congress.

Mr. Kennedy, in his campaign, had denounced Republicans, cast aspersions on the Republican administration of President Eisenhower,
and told the electorate that with a Democratic majority in the Congress he would:

(a) Get the country moving again to solve unemployment,
(b) Restore American prestige abroad,
(c) Strengthen NATO and our other alliances,
(d) Restore freedom to Cuba,
(e) Quickly solve the problem of civil rights at home.

The fact is that he has done none of these things. Unemployment continues unduly high. American prestige has undergone some of its most damaging blows in history. The NATO alliance is shaken. Cuba has become a Soviet military base. And the civil rights issue, because of a 2-year delay before Mr. Kennedy took any important action, has brought unrest, dissension, and strife to our Nation.

And what is Mr. Kennedy's alibi now? Read his own words, uttered at a press conference last year after the 1962 bielections had increased his overwhelming Democratic majority in the Senate and continued his decisive Democratic majority in the House. Here is what President Kennedy said concerning his legislative promises:

We—it really will depend on whether we can maintain a good deal of unity in the Democratic Party and also whether we receive some assistance from some of—some Republicans. If the Republicans vote unanimously against us and we lose 40-odd Democrats—about one-fifth of our number—then we will have difficulty.

If we get the kind of Republican support that we got at the beginning of last year on the rules fight, then we can put some of these important programs through.

Those halting, lame, and apologetic words are from the official White House transcript of President Kennedy's remarks. They say plainly to the American people that despite the fact Mr. Kennedy enjoyed and still enjoys huge Democratic majorities in Congress he cannot exert enough leadership over his own party to enact his program without the help of Republicans.

Only a few days ago on June 23, the President's brother, Robert F. Kennedy, the Attorney General of the United States, pleaded the same lack of leadership in a television interview on civil rights in which he said:

Obviously in order to obtain the passage of this bill we are going to have to have some Republican support. I think that is quite clear.

We, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, believe these demonstrated confessions by the President and his brother, the Attorney General, of lack of leadership over their own party—the Democratic Party—raise these important questions:

1. Is the Democratic Party the true majority party in the United States as Mr. Kennedy contended in his 1960 Presidential campaign, or is it, in fact, two minority parties over which he exercises little or no leadership or control?
2. If, as the President and his brother, the Attorney General, now contend, important accomplishment is not possible without Republican votes in the Congress, despite overwhelming Demo-
cratic majorities in the Senate and the House, then why should
the American people continue to vote for such a divided and lead-
erless political party?

3. If, as the President and his brother, the Attorney General,
assert, important progress in this country and abroad is not pos-
sible without Republican votes, then why shouldn’t the voters
install Republicans in control of the White House and the Con-
gress in 1964 and get real progress?

As Republicans, in a minority position in these turbulent and
critical times in American history, we seek true responsibility con-
ferred on us, not by an apologetic and bankrupt Kennedy leadership,
but by the American people themselves.

It is a confession of failure for the President to use Republicans
as an excuse for the collapse of his leadership. Given a Republican
in the White House and Republican majorities in the Senate and
the House, this country would get the leadership it needs.

This Nation is too important in history, too important in the
world today, too important to the world of the future, to be led by
other than a truly responsible government. We urge upon the
American people the plain fact that the Republican Party, and only
the Republican Party, can provide the responsible leadership so
urgently needed by our Nation both at home and abroad.

CUBA

March 13, 1963

By Senator Dirksen

In the past 3 weeks publication of testimony by CIA Director
John A. McCone and release of a report by a security subcommittee
of the Organization of American States have established beyond a
doubt that Cuba is exporting Communist subversion and sabotage to
the nations of Latin America. With several of these governments al-
ready shaky, the goal is clear. It is the establishment of Communist
governments in addition to Cuba in other parts of our hemisphere.

Mr. McCone says that international brigades of terrorists, sabo-
teurs, and guerrilla fighters are being trained in Cuba, numbering up to
1,500 last year and even more this year. The OAS security report
names and locates 9 Cuban training centers for subversion, 5 or-
organizations for promoting subversion in this hemisphere, and 20 “con-
gresses, conferences, and meetings” which have already been held with
Communist agents from the various Latin American nations in atten-
dance.

Mr. McCone says flatly that “direct Soviet interest in Latin Amer-
ica is clearly increasing.” The OAS subcommittee says “there is
evidence that transfers of funds (to promote prop-
aganda, agitation, and subversion) is being carried out extensively
from Cuba and from other countries of the Communist bloc to the
American Republics.”

For months now the United States has been properly concerned
about the presence of Soviet arms and troops in Cuba. Our efforts
to bring about their removal should not be lessened. But the history
of Communist expansion shows that its most successful weapons have
not been arms, but propaganda, agitation, sabotage, and subversion.
We, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, believe our Government should give the problem of subversion in this hemisphere a priority equal to the problem of Soviet troops and arms in Cuba. We recommend that the United States, as a member of the Organization of American States, take the lead in urging the OAS to set up a system of multilateral agreements to thwart Communist infiltration and subversion.

Already faced with the necessity of freeing Cuba of Communist control, the United States cannot tolerate the prospect of any more Soviet beachheads in this hemisphere.

March 13, 1963

By Representative Halleck

In proposing that the United States take the lead in urging the Organization of American States to formalize methods for combating Communist subversion in Latin America, the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership believes there already exists a firm basis for this action.

In addition to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance and the Caracas Declaration for multilateral action to combat Communist penetration, there exists a set of proposals by the Security Subcommittee of the OAS which could serve as a beginning for the member nations.

The OAS Security Subcommittee recommended that the Latin American nations tighten controls on travel across their borders, place a ban on travel to and from Cuba, take steps to police Communist propaganda, and adopt measures to stop the flow of funds into their countries to finance Communist subversion.

The OAS group stated frankly that other steps of "greater scope" would also be required. We firmly agree. For example, CIA Director John A. McCone says that "one of the most important Communist assets" for carrying out subversion in Latin America is the large number of diplomatic missions maintained there by the satellite nations, by Cuba, and by the Soviet Union itself. This is a question that must be met. And there are, of course, others.

The twin problems of Cuba as a Soviet military base and as an instrument for promoting Communist subversion in this hemisphere are interlocked and are problems for all the Americas. But Ambassador Gonzalo J. Facio, the head of OAS, commenting on Cuba, says, "In the future, the OAS cannot take any step to remove the Communist threat without knowing how the United States is going to confront the menace."

We believe the United States has a real opportunity and certainly the obligation to exert the leadership necessary to organize the nations of this hemisphere into a solid phalanx against Communist infiltration and subversion.

Next week, President Kennedy meets in Costa Rica with the Presidents of six Central American States. We suggest this meeting might provide the President with a forum for preliminary discussions on this vital question.
October 10, 1963

EXECUTIVE USURPATION

By Representative Halleck

In 1961, the Congress wrote stipulations into the foreign aid law forbidding aid to 19 designated Communist nations unless the President found such aid "vital to the security of the United States" and the nation receiving the aid was "not controlled by the international Communist conspiracy."

A year later the Congress wrote a further stipulation in the 1963 foreign aid appropriations act flatly prohibiting military aid to Communist nations, but leaving the President discretion on economic aid if he declared the aforementioned conditions to exist. The announced purpose of this flat prohibition was to stop military aid going to Communist Yugoslavia, 1 of the 19 designated nations.

On May 14, 1963, Mr. Kennedy signed an Executive order permitting the sale of $2 million in military supplies to Yugoslavia and the State Department classified the order "secret." The Presidential order found the sale of these military supplies to Communist Yugoslavia "vital to the security of the United States" etc.—whether this is a correct judgment or not, we do not pretend to know.

All we do know is this—the clear intent of Congress and the specific language of the law were defined by the executive branch and the action classified secret. Thanks to the House Appropriations Committee, the whole business has been declassified, but we do not believe the matter should end there.

There is a basic issue at stake: Can this country long continue as a constitutional government if the acts of Congress can be ignored or circumvented by the executive branch?

For example, Congress has clearly declared a policy against sale of subsidized farm products to Communist nations, but a wheat deal with the Soviet Union has been arranged by President Kennedy without the approval of Congress. The House has stricken authorization in the foreign aid bill for a steel mill in India, but Ambassador Chester Bowles is already publicly assuring India the lack of congressional authorization will be circumvented and the mill will be built.

We think the time has come for a showdown on whether the Congress or the Kennedy administration is writing the laws of the land.

FARM PROGRAM

The following is a series of press questions and answers by Senator Dirksen and Representative Halleck on the farm program as a result of the 547,151 to 597,776 defeat of the wheat referendum on May 21, 1963.

May 23, 1963

QUESTION. Mr. Halleck, do you have any alternative for the wheat control program that has just been defeated? Does the Republican Party have a decision on that?

MR. HALLECK. Well, first, on May 7 the Republican Conference of the House of Representatives said that we deplore the blackjack tactics of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, who is attempting to deny the farmer his free choice by misrepresenting the issues. Then we went on to say in the event the (wheat) referendum fails, we pledge
our support toward and will demand the enactment of sound and constructive legislation during this session of Congress.

Now, as far as I'm concerned, we expect to press for sound, constructive legislation. It should be understood that we are yet in the minority. The responsibility, the primary responsibility, is that of the Kennedy administration and the Democrat-controlled Congress. As far as I'm concerned—and I speak only my personal view—it looks to me like Secretary Freeman has pretty well outlived his usefulness as Secretary of Agriculture and I would express the hope that the Comptroller General's Office and the General Accounting Office would take a look to see just how much of the taxpayers' money was used to try to influence this referendum vote—and as unsuccessfully, I might add. To me it is significant they didn't get two-thirds—they didn't even get a majority.

Now it's obvious that the farmers—just one segment of the population of this country—are not interested in regimentation and controls of the sort that were proposed in this legislation.

So again, may I say, while some of our Republican members have already introduced legislation in this field, there is no official Republican position at this time. We've had no Policy Committee meeting, we had no general meeting of our members on the Agriculture Committee. All I can say is we are ready as responsible Members of the Congress to do everything in our power to cooperate in writing sound, good legislation in this field.

Question. Do you think new legislation is needed, Mr. Halleck?

The farmers voted for none.

Mr. Halleck. Well, I've been through these things before—having been around here a little while. The farmers were told it's this or nothing. The farmers expressed their view and I applaud it. Now, then, I think it's up to the administration to try to get some legislation that is good and effective. If they don't want to do it, they'll just have to take the consequences.

Question. Do you have any idea what the sound and constructive legislation would be like?

Senator Dierksen. Well, hold that a minute. I wanted to comment on this referendum. Forty-seven States voted. It's rather interesting that only six States brought in the necessary two-thirds majority to support the administration program. There were only 15 that turned in a majority. That means there are 32 States that repudiated it on a majority basis and there are 41 States that repudiated it so far as the two-thirds vote is concerned.

Now Mr. Freeman put himself on the line and the freemen on the farms of the country wanted no part of "Freeman." He has been repudiated and these demands that he ought to quit, therefore, have some foundation. A candidate submits himself at election time and when he doesn't command the requisite votes, then that's it. The bell tolls for him. And Mr. Freeman and his compulsive program have now been repudiated. So with respect to any new legislation, you can have constructive legislation and still not go in for compulsion, because that was the real issue before the farmers of the country.

Question. Senator, you said that the reports that he should resign now have foundation. Do you think he should resign?
Senator Dirksen. Well, didn't he stake everything he had, his whole ideology, his whole concept of what ought to be pushed upon the farmers—didn't he submit it, hasn't it been thoroughly repudiated? Where does Mr. Freeman go from here? Unless he reverses his course?

QUESTION. Well, do you think he should resign?

Senator Dirksen. Oh, well, it doesn't make any difference to me, but it would just seem that if he is a man of deep conviction and felt that this had to be done in the interest of sound agriculture, the repudiation ought to dictate to Mr. Freeman himself what he should do.

Mr. Halleck. May I add just one more word to that? If you're looking at it politically, I kinda hope he stays on.

QUESTION. Would there be any possible thoughts in Congress at all for letting an absolutely free market operate, since this is set up, and take the time to actually study the free market situation and see how far agriculture in this country is going to go to manage its own affairs without congressional interference, the expenditure of the taxpayers' money——

Mr. Halleck. Let me just say this. When President Eisenhower was elected President, took office, we had 90 percent of parity support price. I was the Majority Leader in the House of Representatives in the 83d Congress. Some of you will recall that we began to break away from the high support price. Now our idea then was—and it's still my idea—that you just can't yank the rug out all at once, completely. To my mind that would be economic chaos in agriculture and probably followed by economic chaos in the country.

But what we talked about then was a program of graduality and you will recall that the first year we broke the support price to 82.5—subsequently to 75 percent.

So, I think that's about my position today, if I understood the question correctly—that certainly you just can't move all the way all at once. I haven't heard anyone advocate that—maybe some people have. But I think it is a process of graduality that is involved here. I think that is the position we should take.

July 18, 1963

By Representative Halleck

Of all the Kennedy administration's unrealized 1960 campaign pledges, probably the sorriest of the lot is the string of broken promises to the American farmer. Mr. Kennedy’s words at Des Moines, Iowa, on August 21, 1960, were stirring indeed:

(The Democratic) platform pledges, in unmistakable language, “positive action to raise farm income to full parity of income levels * * *”. This is the strongest pledge ever given to the farmers of America by any political party in history. I stand behind that pledge, and I intend to make good on it, beginning next January.

Those are Mr. Kennedy's words. Here is his performance:

The parity ratio between the farmer's production costs and what he gets for his product has fallen to 77 in 1963, the lowest point since the depression year of 1939.
The price index for farm products when Mr. Kennedy took office was 242. Under his administration it has dropped to 241. The farmer's cost index stood at 301 when Mr. Kennedy took office. Under his administration it has risen to 311, the highest in history. In other words under the Kennedy administration the farmer is caught in the worst cost-price squeeze in 30 years.

In 1960, the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar was 39 cents. Under Mr. Kennedy today it has dropped to 37 cents.

About the only thing in agriculture that has gone up under Mr. Kennedy is the cost of running the Department of Agriculture. Despite the fact that there are 369,000 less farms since the Kennedy administration took office and at least a million fewer farmers, the Department of Agriculture's payroll will have increased by 19,000 employees at the end of this fiscal year and the cost of the farm program will have shot up to $8.5 billion, an alltime record high. Why does it cost more to administer fewer farms? Why does it take more Federal employees to serve fewer farmers?

There is only one way to describe the Kennedy administration's performance—it is a dismal failure.

July 18, 1963

By Senator Dirksen

The economic plight of the American farmer is matched only by the complete lack of understanding by the Kennedy administration of this Nation's agricultural problem.

The cotton and dairy programs are in a mess because of maladministration by the Department of Agriculture. The wheat program is in a shambles while the Kennedy administration, because of the overwhelming defeat it suffered in the wheat referendum, has sulked instead of giving support to Congress to enact the needed legislation.

The huge investments in surpluses by the Commodity Credit Corporation, which the Kennedy administration claimed were being reduced, have actually increased by $800 million since last year and hang like the sword of Damocles over the agricultural market.

The Secretary of Agriculture and eight departmental administrative assistants are in the Soviet Union on a month tour of Communist nations. What better place could there be to study the kind of straitjacket controls, fines, and jail sentences Mr. Freeman advocates for American farmers than in the Soviet Union?

Truly, the American farmer is the forgotten man of the Kennedy administration. His innate spirit of independence, his love of freedom as expressed in the wheat referendum last May, have only subjected the farmer to the threat of reprisals from the Kennedy administration.

We, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, believe the American farmer deserves a better deal than one which offers only financial ruin on one hand, or arbitrary controls and regimentation on the other. Certainly the wheat farmer was given no other choice by the unsympathetic Kennedy administration.

Republicans have already introduced legislation to give the wheat farmer a voluntary program that makes sense and we intend to exert
every effort to achieve that goal in this session of Congress, the indifference of President Kennedy notwithstanding.

Presented by Representative Bob Dole (Republican, Kansas), who represents the largest wheat district in the U.S. Congress, at the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership news conference following a meeting with the Leadership, in behalf of the following members who were also present: Representatives Albert Quie (Republican, Minnesota) and Don Short (Republican, North Dakota), and Senators Bourke Hickenlooper (Republican, Iowa), Karl Mundt (Republican, South Dakota), and Roman Hruska (Republican, Nebraska).

August 22, 1963

By Representative Dole.

Three months ago American wheat farmers in a national referendum rejected the administration's strict control certificate wheat plan by an overwhelming margin. In turning down this Kennedy-Freeman control scheme, they did not believe that the only alternative was the administration forecast of a ruined market which would spell financial disaster and hardship to the rural economy.

Yet clearly the wheat farmers of this Nation are faced with an unacceptable and undesirable program which the administration seems intent on forcing upon them as "punishment" for not buckling under in the referendum.

We are sorry to see Secretary Freeman again restating that position as he did yesterday when he said there is no interest or concern for wheat legislation which, in his words, has now become mere "academic discussion."

Long before the wheat referendum was held, many of us in Congress began to work on a voluntary wheat program for 1964 which would be fair to farmers, consumers, and taxpayers. Since the referendum over 50 bills have been introduced, both Republican and Democrat, both in the House and in the Senate, in an effort to offset the administration's disastrous program to "let the farmer stew in his own juice." The time has now come for this reservoir of congressional interest and concern about wheat farmers to be converted into legislative action which will prevent unnecessary suffering in the farm areas of our Nation. Congress has ample opportunity to take action.

We again call upon the administration and the Democratic leadership in Congress to lend their support to the enactment of remedial farm legislation this year.

October 24, 1963

By Representative Halleck.

If the American people need proof, which is doubtful, that it costs more for the Kennedy administration to do less, they need only look at the New Frontier farm program.

It is an appalling failure—appalling in increased cost, shocking in lack of results for the farmer.

In his third TV debate with Vice President Nixon in 1960, Mr. Kennedy told the American people:

It's my best judgment that our agricultural program will cost a billion and a half, possibly $2 billion less than the present agricultural program.
The farm program in the last Eisenhower year cost a total of $5.5 billion. It has never been within a billion and a half of that figure since Mr. Kennedy took office and his program for this year is budgeted at approximately $8.5 billion—or $3 billion more than the last Eisenhower year.

Why? You only need to look at the feed grains programs for an example of the incredible mismanagement. The average production of feed grains, of which corn is the major item, was 152.6 million tons for the average base years, 1959-60. Production this year is officially estimated at 152 million tons, only 600,000 tons less.

Now let's look at the cost for this insignificant reduction. Representative Paul Findley, of Illinois, a Republican member of the House Agriculture Committee, has supplied the figures.

The corn equivalent of the 600,000-ton reduction is only 21.4 million bushels. Payments to farmers and other direct costs total $924.5 million for the year. This means the American taxpayers have been soaked a fantastic $43 for each bushel of corn not grown, a commodity that sells on the market for about $1 a bushel.

Farmers themselves showed how disgusted they were when they overwhelmingly rejected last May a Kennedy program for wheat. Likewise, they resent the fact that the parity ratio between what they must buy and what they sell has dropped to 77, the lowest figure since the depression 1930's. If the farmers don't like Mr. Kennedy's wasteful $8.5 billion program, why should anybody support it?

November 7, 1963

By Senator Dirksen

If any Democrats are perplexed as to why they did so poorly in rural counties in this week's elections, they have only to examine the appalling record of the Kennedy administration in the field of agriculture. Here are some facts:

The parity ratio between what the farmer must buy and what he receives for his commodities dropped to 79 in 1962 which is the lowest level since 1939.

Farm debt is at its highest level in history—$28.9 billion.

Farming costs are at their highest level in history—an index of 312 which is over three times the base period.

Total projected expenditures by the Department of Agriculture are the highest in history—$8.5 billion which is 55 percent higher than the last Eisenhower year.

Total number of Government employees in the Department of Agriculture is the highest in history—116,000.

The farm population is the lowest in a hundred years—only 14.3 million.

Farm surpluses are up to $7.2 billion—more than a half billion dollars higher than last year.

Net farm income is down to $12.6 billion which is $700 million less than a year ago and $200 million less than in 1961.
But these cold facts are not all. With Government-held surpluses at $7.2 billion, the United States actually imported $3.5 billion in farm commodities with more than half the imports competitive with what the American farmer produces.

While campaigning for President in 1960, Mr. Kennedy repeatedly said, "It is time for a fresh and imaginative program" for agriculture. Such a program has yet to be offered by the Kennedy administration. Nor is one in prospect. Farmers in 1964 won't be listening to Mr. Kennedy; they'll be looking at the record.

When the Kennedy program takes more money and more Federal employees to service less farmers with less results, something is certainly wrong.

---

**FOREIGN AFFAIRS, CONDUCT OF**


*February 11, 1963*

By the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership

One of the basic concepts of American foreign policy for scores of years has been a lasting friendship with Great Britain, France, and Canada. The British, French, and Canadians have been more than our allies in war; they have deep ethnic and historical ties with us.

In recent weeks we have witnessed anti-American sentiment sweeping each of these three great nations because of the inept conduct of our foreign affairs by the Kennedy administration.

The French, claiming that Europe can't count on the United States to use nuclear force in the event of attack on the Continent, are attempting to reshape the European Community to diminish America's leadership. The Kennedy administration's renewed emphasis on conventional forces, the 1962 Cuban showdown and the Skybolt incident have all been employed by the French as arguments to move her sister European states into a "third force."

The Canadian Government has fallen because of a needless public statement by the Kennedy administration on an issue—acceptance of U.S. nuclear weapons for Canada's armed forces—on which the United States was probably right but was so unwisely represented that the heads of all four Canadian political parties denounced us.

The British Government was for a time similarly threatened, again on an American issue—the cancellation of the Skybolt missile program—which was abruptly brought to a climax by our Government without proper regard for the repercussions that might follow.

The standing of the United States with our three historic allies is far below the plateau of prestige promised by Mr. Kennedy in the 1960 campaign. But the severe damage to American prestige does not stop at the borders of Great Britain, France, and Canada.
The NATO nations, their unity already shaken by French efforts to realign free Europe, are wondering how much longer U.S. bases on the Continent will be maintained now that our missiles are being withdrawn from the soil of Turkey, Italy, and Great Britain.

Even Spain, which is not a member of NATO, is exhibiting evasiveness in opening negotiations for renewal of its pact which grants the United States bases in Spain in return for aid.

Portugal remembers our inaction on the Indian-Goa issue and our United Nations votes against her on Angola. The Netherlands has not forgotten our part in the delivery of Netherlands New Guinea to Indonesia.

Certainly, as President Kennedy recently remarked in a meeting with the press, frictions occur from time to time in our relations with our allies, but the Kennedy administration is developing more friction and less friendship daily.

Obviously the kind of leadership so vital to keeping free peoples united has not been in evidence so far in this administration.

We, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, feel it imperative for the President to reassess our policies toward our allies and particularly to reexamine the machinery which helps formulate policy and place it in operation. It is apparent, at least in the cases of Great Britain and Canada, that important channels of communications were not properly used or the embarrassments engendered would not have occurred.

In these days of Communist thrusts in Asia, Africa, and our own hemisphere, witness Cuba, we feel it vital that American relations within the free nations be maintained on the most effective level for our joint security. As the leader of the free world this Nation cannot afford to do less.

May 23, 1963

By Senator Dirksen

Three years ago, on June 14, 1960, a Member of the Senate, John F. Kennedy, declared:

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

Mr. Kennedy has now been President for 2 years and 4 months. If any new national strategy has been devised it is not visible. If any carefully prepared, long-term policies have been initiated they are not yet in evidence. And the Soviets create the crises and the Kennedy administration reacts—sometimes not at the 11th hour but at the last minute, witness Cuba.
Consider our present standing with our friends:
Our relations with Britain, France, Canada, the Netherlands, Belgium, Portugal, Pakistan, Thailand, and Peru have been bungled to the point that friendships have been strained and our prestige lowered. The NATO alliance is in a state of jitters. The so-called Alliance for Progress has been more an exercise in headlines than in progress.

Consider our present standing with our enemies:
Numerous gestures to the Kremlin, countless concessions on a nuclear test ban, and much wishful thinking concerning relations between the Soviet Union and Red China have only produced the Berlin wall, fighting in Vietnam, a serious deterioration in Laos, an increase in the nuclear strength of the Soviet Union and a Soviet base in Cuba.

And what is the policy toward Communist expansion? Apparently this administration has embraced a "wait and see" policy. It is a New Frontier version of the old Dean Acheson "wait until the dust settles" policy that cost us China and finally got us into the Korean war. It is the same policy that let offensive missiles be landed in Cuba last fall; it is the same policy that today is letting us drift into a dangerous situation in Latin America.

As responsible Members of Congress we must ask: What future is there for America under such a policy?

May 23, 1963
By Representative Halleck

Our serious concern for our foreign relations has not been lessened by the evidence the Kennedy administration's "wait and see" policy is based on the unrealistic notion that the Soviet Union is "mellowing."
The chief advocate of this wistful hope, Walt Rostow, head of State Department policy planning, was given the opportunity a year ago before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to deny his sponsorship of this theory. He did not deny it.
Evidently the landing of missiles in Cuba 4 months later did nothing to persuade Mr. Rostow that his thesis might be 100 percent wrong. On the contrary, he has recently been directly quoted as describing this administration's foreign policy in these words:

We seek to build a community of independent nations, their governments increasingly responsive to the consent of the governed, cooperating of their own free will in their areas of interdependence, settling their disputes by peaceful means. On the basis of this kind of community of free nations, we seek by every means at our disposal compatible with our own security and that of other free nations to bring the arms race under control and to move nations under Communist control toward acceptance of the principles of national independence, human freedom, international legal order and peace.
I don’t know what century Mr. Rostow thinks he is living in, but the rest of us must face up to the hard 20th century fact that since 1945 the Communists have taken over a third of the world’s population, that more recently they have been:

- Warring on India, Laos, and Vietnam;
- Making substantial headway in Brazil, Venezuela, and British Guiana;
- Exporting arms and Soviet troops to Cuba; and
- Flaunting the rights of every free nation on earth by attempting to infiltrate them and take them over.

If a nation ever needed a realistic foreign policy, this Nation needs it now.

May 31, 1963

By the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership

We have always encouraged a bipartisan approach to foreign policy and want to continue to do so. However, one of the major problems in Washington today is discovering what the Kennedy administration’s foreign policy is.

President Kennedy’s so-called Grand Design for Europe is now inoperative and has been for many months.

The administration’s policy of concessions to the Soviet Union in the nuclear test ban negotiations has only resulted in the Russians becoming bolder in blocking a treaty.

The NATO alliance, despite a modest recovery attempt last week at Ottawa, is in a doubtful condition, and most of its members, including Britain, France, Canada, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Portugal, have been aggrieved by one policy mishap or another sponsored by the Kennedy administration.

What is the policy toward the Soviet Union and its satellites? No one seems to know.

What is the policy on Cuba? No one seems to know.

What became of the onsite inspection agreement for Cuba between Khrushchev and President Kennedy? No one seems to know.

The list goes on. What is the policy on the Communist-threatened countries of Laos, Brazil, Venezuela, and British Guiana? No one seems to know.

Those close to the administration talk about “waiting.” For what? A “wait and see” policy leaves the initiative entirely to the Communist bloc. Is that the policy?

The concept of bipartisan support for foreign policy can only be effective when the supporters know what policy they are asked to support.

We find we are not alone in our uncertainty. A number of Democratic Senators have been expressing their doubts also in recent weeks. Major publications likewise have raised questions in their news and editorial comment.
We, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, suggest that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs invite the appropriate officials of the executive branch to appear before those committees for a clear and concise review of foreign policy.

Such a review, conducted responsibly by all parties to it, might do much to remove doubt where doubt now exists, sharpen viewpoints at the policymaking level, and enlighten not only the American people but our friends abroad as well.

June 13, 1963

By Senator Dirksen

President Kennedy's proposal to “reexamine our attitude toward the Soviet Union” is a triumph for the accommodators in his administration and it flies in the face of all known experience in dealing with the Communists.

The decision contradicts Mr. Kennedy’s own public estimates of the Communist conspiracy both before and since he became President. Mr. Kennedy disclosed his decision over the weekend like a shot from the hip, without visible consultation with Members of Congress, and on the tissue-paper grounds that somehow, someplace, sometime a nuclear test ban agreement with the Soviets might be reached.

Mr. Kennedy’s announcement of a self-imposed nuclear test moratorium is grave enough to contemplate, but when it and a mere scenery shift of negotiations from neutral Geneva to hostile Moscow are used to ornament a major change in policy, we are deeply troubled.

The President tells us “that constructive changes within the Communist bloc might bring within reach solutions which now seem beyond us.” What constructive changes? The Berlin wall? Vietnam? Laos? Missiles sneaked into Cuba?
Mr. Kennedy says

we must conduct our affairs in such a way that it becomes in
the Communists' interest to agree on a genuine peace.

Is the burden of conduct now on us? Are we to deduce the Com-
munists have been right all along—only we must change?

Persons who see an “accommodation as impossible” are called de-
featists by Mr. Kennedy. Those who want “universal peace” are
called “fanatics.” Obviously in between are the accommodators and,
in Mr. Kennedy’s words, they are the ones who want to “make the
world safe for diversity.”

What is “diversity”? Does this phrase translate into “make the
world safe for coexistence,” half free and half Communist? Mr.
Kennedy does not explain.

But we, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leaders-
ship, intend to find out. Two weeks ago we urged the Senate Foreign
Relations and the House Foreign Affairs Committees to conduct a
review of foreign policy. Now, with President Kennedy’s drastic
shift in policy toward the Soviet Union, we deem such a review
imperative.

(See Representative Halleck’s statement of June 13, 1963, p. 31.)

ADDITIONAL REMARKS BY MR. HALLECK

What has caused President Kennedy’s shift in policy? He gives no
substantive reasons and we know of none. Therefore we are attaching
a compilation of Mr. Kennedy’s previous policy statements in juxta-
position with his assertions on Monday, June 10, 1963. We believe
every American should examine them to fully comprehend the
enormity of the shift in policy they represent.
(The following was released with Senator Dirksen’s and Representative Halleck’s statements of June 13, 1963:)

Comparison of excerpts from President Kennedy’s speech at American University on June 10, 1963, with previous statements Mr. Kennedy made both before and since he became President

PREVIOUS STATEMENTS

“A few weeks ago Mr. Nixon put forth his program for peace. The program consisted of setting up more committees and more conferences. It depended on meetings between heads of state and discussions among our own top officials. It was based on the premise that the battle for peace was a battle of words—that we could end the threat of war by talking it away. Thus it is a program which does not grapple with the real nature of the Communist threat to peace. For peace will not come solely through the conference room and the propaganda machine.”—Milwaukee, Wis., October 23, 1960.

“I have said that I thought that we should try once again a new administration. If I’m successful, that wouldn’t be until January *** therefore I’d make one more effort.

“Now, until the negotiators have met, I don’t think it’s probably wise to give an ultimatum, to say that unless they have an agreement by February 1 or March 1, but I do think they should be making progress. We should know after 3 weeks or so, 4 weeks, whether we’re making any progress. It may be appropriate then to set the time limit.”—Face the Nation, October 30, 1960.

FROM JUNE 10, 1963 SPEECH

“*** Chairman Khrushchev, Prime Minister Macmillan, and I have agreed that high-level discussions will shortly begin in Moscow looking toward early agreement on a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Our hopes must be tempered with the caution of history—but with our hopes go the hopes of all mankind.”
"No, I'm not hopeful, not hopeful. There doesn't seem to be any sense of movement since December on the offer of two or three (inspections) that the Soviets have made. We've tried to see if they will change that figure. We have * * * reduced our requirements. We've indicated a willingness to negotiate further. We've tried to get an agreement on all the rest of it and then come to the question of the number of inspections, but we were unable to get that. So I would say I'm not hopeful at all."—News Conference, May 8, 1963.

"Our greatest challenge is still the world that lies beyond the cold war—but the first great obstacle is still our relations with the Soviet Union and Communist China. We must never be lulled into believing that either power has yielded its ambitions for world domination—ambitions which they forcefully restated only a short time ago."—State of the Union, January 30, 1961.

"We know enough now about broken negotiations, secret preparations, and the (Soviet) advantages gained from a long test series never to offer again an un inspected moratorium."—TV speech to Nation, March 2, 1962.

"Gentlemen's agreements and moratoria do not provide the type of guarantees that are necessary. They do not give assurance against an abrupt renewal of testing by unilateral action. This is the lesson of the Soviet Government's tragic decision to renew testing just a year ago. Nor can such informal arrangements give any assurance against secret underground testing. * * * The United States cannot be a party to any renewal of false hopes

"Let us reexamine our attitude toward the cold war. Let us remember that we are not engaged in a debate, seeking to pile up debating points. We are not here distributing blame or pointing the finger of judgment. We must deal with the world as it is, and not as it might have been had the history of the last 18 years been different."

"* * * to make clear our good faith and solemn convictions on the matter I now declare that the United States does not propose to conduct nuclear tests in the atmosphere so long as other states do not do so. We will not be the first to resume."
which the Soviet Government shattered last September."

"** ** what can we do to move from the present pause toward enduring peace? Again I would consult caution. I foresee no spectacular reversal in Communist methods or goals. But if all these trends and developments can persuade the Soviet Union to walk the path of peace, then let her know that all free nations will join with her. But until that choice is made, and until the world can develop a reliable system of international security, the free peoples have no choice but to keep their arms near."—State of the Union, January 14, 1963.

"** ** what comfort can we take from the increasing strains and tensions within the Communist bloc? Here hope must be tempered with caution. For the Soviet-Chinese disagreement is over means, not ends. A dispute over how to bury the West is no grounds for Western rejoicing."—State of the Union, January 14, 1963.

"** ** let us reexamine our attitude toward the Soviet Union ** ** both the United States and its allies, and the Soviet Union and its allies, have a mutually deep interest in a just and genuine peace and in halting the arms race ** ** So, let us not be blind to our differences—but let us also direct attention to our common interests and to the means by which those differences can be resolved. And if we cannot now end our differences, at least we can help make the world safe for diversity."
July 11, 1963

By Senator Dirksen

In the month that has passed since President Kennedy's statement on foreign policy at American University, the best summation of the speech has come from Radio Moscow which termed it a "renunciation of the policy of strength." (State Department transcript, Moscow, 0112, G.m.t., June 12, 1963.)

Because the Soviet Union and Red China have disagreed over Soviet advocacy of "coexistence," Radio Moscow found much in the President's speech to applaud since it put Mr. Kennedy's stamp of approval on "coexistence" of freedom and communism side by side. We think, however, there is very little in all this for America to cheer.

Last January in his state of the Union message, President Kennedy noted that the Soviet-Chinese disagreement over "how to bury the West" was no cause for joy. In a magazine article published this month, U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson writes that the dispute between the Soviet Union and Red China concerns only whether the West "should be peacefully or violently buried—they are both for the funeral."

Mr. Kennedy's speech approving coexistence puts the United States in the awkward position of endorsing one method of burial for the West over another, of choosing between the undertakers.

What hope of freedom remains for the Poles, the Czechs, the Hungarians, the East Germans, and countless other people behind the Iron Curtain under Mr. Kennedy's new policy of "making the world safe" for coexistence? Does U.S. endorsement of coexistence mean that the Castro Communist government in Cuba will be permitted permanently to "coexist" only 90 miles from Florida?

Isn't it strange that in May 1961 Mr. Kennedy was talking about "expansion of freedom"; now under the new policy he only talks about "defending" freedom?

We, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, believe the President's departure from a policy of strength is a grave error that will come to plague America more and more if the new policy of coexistence is pursued.

September 26, 1963

By the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership

ANOTHER CUBA?

Another Communist takeover of a Latin American country is imminent and only the most persuasive diplomacy by the U.S. Government can prevent it.

The country is British Guiana, a crown colony which is scheduled to be given its full independence by Great Britain by the end of this year. We feel present conditions compel us to oppose such a course. Here are the facts:

Under a constitution which Britain has the authority to suspend, the domestic Guianese Government is headed by Cheddi Jagan, who, along with his Chicago-born wife, is an avowed Marxist. Because of multiparty elections, Jagan has the electoral support of only 42 per-
cent of the people, but, with the backing of the Kremlin—only this month freshly reiterated by Moscow—he would give communism a solid beachhead on the continent of South America.

There can be no doubt about the menace. The Jagan government is already serving as a way station for smuggling Communist agents and funds from Cuba and the Iron Curtain countries into Latin American nations. Soviet ships bring kerosene, gasoline, and oil. Bank records show indirect financial aid from the Soviet Union and Cuba for the Jagan regime.

Nevertheless, Great Britain apparently has every intention of pulling out and turning her colony over to the Jagan government. When President Kennedy was asked about the problem at his August 21 press conference, he said it was "primarily a British matter and we should leave the judgment to them."

We, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, do not agree. We think it is primarily a free world problem. It should be removed from the shadow of diplomatic niceties and be brought right out into the open. If the United States and Great Britain, who shared the blood-soaked responsibilities of two world wars, can't openly meet this problem in British Guiana, then Communist takeovers can only multiply in the future.

October 10, 1963

By Senator Dirksen

In a campaign speech at the Alamo in San Antonio, September 12, 1960, John F. Kennedy criticized President Eisenhower's Latin-American policy and then made this promise:

Seven years ago there were 15 strong men in Latin America dominating the life of their countries. Today there are only five. Three years from now there won't be any. Latin America will be free.

President Kennedy's 3 years have passed and the scoreboard shows that Mr. Kennedy's policies have played havoc in Latin America.

Starting with the incredible 1961 Bay of Pigs blunder which cemented Castro's dictatorship, there have been a series of disasters to constitutional governments in Latin America and more are threatened. In 1962, there were military coups in the Argentine and in Peru; then Ecuador, now the Dominican Republic and Honduras. El Salvador, Colombia, Venezuela, and even Brazil are tottering. Only in the Argentine and Peru has there been any recovery.

The Alliance for Progress has been futilely administered. The Organization of American States has been a paper structure waiting for the leadership President Kennedy promised but has never given.

Why has the trend away from dictatorship and military rule that marked Latin America during the Eisenhower years been reversed under Kennedy? Could it be the preference of the Kennedy administration for what is described in Latin America as "democratic left" governments? Could it be the lack of U.S. leadership in helping combat the wave of Communist agitation and sabotage which has struck many Latin American nations?
Clearly a complete review of Kennedy policy in Latin America is urgently needed. At the rate governments are falling it can't come too soon.

October 24, 1963

By Senator Dirksen

This is the anniversary week of the showdown on Soviet nuclear missiles in Cuba, but there is serious doubt that much has been learned from that typical example of Communist treachery.

The Soviet retreat of a year ago has been followed by another typical example of Communist guile—a peace offensive. Premier Khrushchev, since December, has been preaching "peaceful coexistence," a party line as old as communism.

President Kennedy responded on June 10, in his American University speech, calling on Americans to "reevaluate our attitude toward the Soviet Union," and "to help make the world safe for diversity." This means coexistence.

This week President Tito of Communist Yugoslavia proposed that the United Nations "codify the principles of peaceful coexistence" to give "even more powerful expression to the lofty ideals and goals of our age."

We say this is an affront to, and a desecration of, the United Nations Charter which was designed to do what Communist subversion and aggression have prevented it from doing for 18 years—preserving peace in the world.

The tragic roll need only be recalled: Poland, Albania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Rumania, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, China, North Korea, North Vietnam, Tibet, and Cuba—every one a victim of Communist military force or occupation. It took a war and 150,000 American casualties to save South Korea, and a full-scale war goes on today to save South Vietnam. Are these the "lofty ideals and goals" upon which Communists expound?

We suggest to President Kennedy a formula for measuring the validity of Communist pretensions toward peace: Let the Communists give the world some concrete evidence of their desires by a cease-fire and withdrawal in South Vietnam, removal of Soviet troops from Cuba, an end to Communist terror in Venezuela, and destruction of the Berlin wall. It is time the United States made the demands instead of the Soviet Union and won concessions instead of making them.

---

August 30, 1963

By the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership

The action of the House of Representatives reducing the authorized foreign aid program to $3.5 billion, and President Kennedy's characterization of it as "shortsighted, unwise, and dangerously partisan," warrant an examination of the facts.

Fact No. 1.—If bipartisan support of the foreign aid program has now been "destroyed"—to use the President's word—it was Mr. Kennedy's own unwise statement which destroyed it. It would have better become the office of the Presidency had Mr. Kennedy at the
Fact No. II.—This country still has a representative form of government. When the elected Representatives vote 222 to 188 after 3 days of consideration in the House to reduce the foreign aid authorization from $4.1 billion to $3.5 billion, the President might consider that their votes represent their districts instead of issuing a highly partisan statement bristling with adjectives attacking their judgment, their motives and, in fact, their patriotism.

Fact No. III.—Although the President in his statement said that during his 8 years as a Member of the Senate he “consistently” supported President Eisenhower’s requests on foreign aid, the records of the Senate show otherwise. As a Senator, Mr. Kennedy actually voted five different times to reduce foreign aid, the cuts totaling $1.37 billion, or more than twice as much as the cut he now criticizes.

Fact No. IV.—Foreign aid is not an innovation, unknown to Congress. The Congress has been dealing with the subject for 19 years now. During that time the gigantic sum of more than $100 billion has been expended by the United States to assist foreign nations. Members of the Senate and House repeatedly have made overseas inspection trips and invariably returned with increasing criticism of the program. And, we must note, the most vocal critics have been Democrats. The plain truth is that, because of waste, inefficiency, and maladministration, the foreign aid program today enjoys little real support on either side of the aisles of Congress and the President knows it. Nineteen years of uninterrupted military and economic assistance to all parts of the world should have produced happier results than what we see today.

Fact No. V.—The President’s own fiscal program has not helped the cause of foreign aid. He has proposed to increase Federal spending by $4.5 billion to an all-time record high, while advocating a tax cut of $10 billion on borrowed money. At the same time the balance of trade deficit, to which foreign aid has substantially contributed, reached in the last quarter a record annual rate of $5.2 billion under his administration. All efforts to get the President to make voluntary reduction in Federal spending or to accede to congressional cuts have met with increasing resistance from the White House, the reaction to the reduction in foreign aid being the most extreme example.

Fact No. VI.—In a letter August 19 to Representative Wilbur D. Mills, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, President Kennedy declared the tax reduction, pending in the committee, “must also * * * be accompanied by the exercise of an even tighter rein on Federal expenditures * * *.” But when the House on August 23 tightened the reins of foreign aid, the President’s reaction was not unexpected—he blasted the economizers for doing what he advocated only 4 days earlier.

It is evident the President has introduced a double standard for measuring bipartisan support.

The public has been told by President Kennedy on numerous occasions that his programs can’t get through Congress without Republican support despite the huge majorities of 2 to 1 in the
Senate and 3 to 2 in the House which his own political party enjoys. But when the legislative action has been concluded, if Mr. Kennedy has scored a success, the Democrats get the credit, if a defeat, the Republicans get the blame.

Now with the President’s latest statement we have a new variation: any vote for spending is bipartisan; a vote against it is “shocking and thoughtless * * * shortsighted, irresponsible, and dangerously partisan”—but only if a Republican casts it.

The American people will not soon forget the flagrant example of the White House double standard applied last year to one of the strongest supporters of bipartisan foreign policy ever in the Congress, Dr. Walter H. Judd of Minnesota, a Republican.

On October 6, 1962, while Representative Judd was on the House floor fighting to protect the 1962 foreign aid appropriation bill, President Kennedy on the very same day was in Minneapolis calling for Dr. Judd’s eventual defeat.

For a President who avows his desire for bipartisan support, Mr. Kennedy’s cynical double standard does little to promote it.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRESS

August 14, 1963

By Senator Dirksen

In 1946 Congress passed a law reforming its committee structures, authorizing professional staffs and providing for the adjournment of the legislative branch by July 31 each year. It is now evident that the sponsors of that legislation never dreamed there would be a Kennedy administration only 15 years later.

As of July 31, this year, the Kennedy administration had submitted 403 legislative requests to Congress and only 19 of them had been enacted into law. According to this survey (made by Congressional Quarterly), the President’s performance was only 4.7 percent, an all-time record low. Congress is still in session and will undoubtedly be when next winter’s snows are being swept off the Capitol steps.

Certainly the American people are entitled to ask: With Democrats in the White House and in control of every single agency of the Federal Government; with Democrats outnumbering Republicans 2 to 1 in the Senate and 3 to 2 in the House, where is the dynamic leadership that was so glowingly promised in the 1960 campaign?

Apologists for the Democrats are now trying to blame Congress as an institution, claiming its machinery is outmoded. Apparently Congress only became outmoded since Mr. Kennedy took office—there was no hue and cry about this supposed obsolescence during the 8 Eisenhower years.

The truth is that it is not Congress but Mr. Kennedy’s legislative program which is outmoded.

Recordbreaking Federal spending, planned $12 billion deficits, and the ever-increasing White House demand for more power are not geared to the 1960’s but to the New Deal depression years. There is no public demand for youth camps, area redevelopment, and the
whole string of Federal boondoggles, nor is there any enthusiasm in Congress for them. That is why most of Mr. Kennedy’s program is bogged down and why only essential legislation will eventually pass.

November 7, 1963

By Representative Halleck

When historians look back at the year 1963 they undoubtedly will be hard pressed to explain to future generations how a Kennedy Democrat administration which had promised so much accomplished so little with such overwhelming Democrat majorities in both branches of the 88th Congress.

In truth, they will only be able to conclude that no President in history ever had a worse record of legislative results in a single session of Congress. And of course they will look for the reasons. They won’t be hard to find.

Mr. Kennedy’s proposals have for the most part been warmed-over New Deal depression panaceas which didn’t work 30 years ago and are woefully outdated today. They command the support of neither the public nor the Congress.

Mr. Kennedy’s economic theories defy commonsense. He is the first President who ever proposed increased Federal spending while simultaneously advocating a reduction in taxes. And the historians will note that Congress held up appropriations bills and cut them substantially, while postponing the tax cut until the next year.

Save for the college facilities bill, the 88th Congress, 1st session, will go into the record books without a single new major enactment despite the fact the session lasted the entire year.

Finally, if the historians have access to the TV news clips they undoubtedly will study the significance of films showing President Kennedy addressing a Democratic political rally in Philadelphia, October 30. He reminded his audience that as a Presidential candidate 3 years earlier in Philadelphia he had declared he believed in an America “that is on the march... an America that is moving, doing, working, trying...”

“Today, America is on the march,” Mr. Kennedy said in his peroration last week, “America is moving, doing, working, trying...”

His partisan Democrat audience just looked at him. There was no applause.

Of such revelations history is made.

November 21, 1963

By Senator Dirksen

There is a faltering effort now underway by apologists for the White House to blame the Congress because President Kennedy’s legislative program is in a mess. This effort will fail because the blame lies squarely on the White House doorstep and any reasonable examination of the facts will show it.

Mr. Kennedy has been guilty of two major blunders.
First, he proposed that taxes be cut while he increased Federal deficit spending. This unprecedented proposal not only met heavy opposition in the Congress, but reliable samples of public opinion showed the American people were also opposed to a tax cut without a cut in spending.

Second, the President, who had promised major civil rights legislation in 1961, failed to live up to his promise. It was not until June 19, 1963, that he submitted a civil rights program, only after the crisis of demonstrations and violence forced his hand. Then he expected Congress to act in a few months on a program he had delayed 2½ years.

Historically, the passage of civil rights legislation is a long, drawn-out affair. This is because many members of Mr. Kennedy's own political party are opposed to civil rights legislation. Had the President kept his campaign pledge and sent his program to Congress in 1961, new civil rights statutes would have been on the books before demonstrations and violence were ever precipitated.

As for a tax cut, Mr. Kennedy could have had it this year had he cut spending. But he did the opposite: He asked for a $4.5 billion increase in spending and $7.8 billion in future authorizations. The opposition by the Congress and the American people has not been to a tax cut but to increased spending and a tax cut. As matters now stand Congress has decided to delay action on tax legislation until it has had a look at Mr. Kennedy's January budget for next year.

In the final analysis, it is President Kennedy's own mismanagement of his legislative program that has kept Congress in session since last January and everybody in Washington knows it.

In all the welter of criticism the meat of the coconut is overlooked—it is the basic divergence of opinion between the President on the one hand and the American people and the Congress on the other.

November 21, 1963

By Representative Halleck

During the 1960 Presidential campaign, Mr. Kennedy filled the airwaves with what he called the need for strong leadership, the need to go forward with vigor. If we examine President Kennedy's handling of his legislative program for his first 3 years, his 1960 campaign cries are more applicable today than 3 years ago.

Mr. Kennedy asked Congress for an Alliance for Progress authorization for Latin America, and Congress gave it to him. The program has never even gotten off the ground.

Mr. Kennedy asked Congress for a Trade Expansion Act to facilitate his Grand Design for Europe, and Congress gave it to him. The Grand Design collapsed over a year ago and has not been heard of since.

Mr. Kennedy asked Congress for depressed areas and retraining legislation to solve unemployment, and Congress gave it to him. Not even a dent has been made in unemployment.

Mr. Kennedy asked Congress for an Urban Affairs Department, social security medical care, massive Federal aid to education, and similar proposals. These Congress has not given to him. Why? For a number of reasons, but mainly because there has been no wide public support for them.
Together with the delayed tax cut and civil rights measures these legislative items and enactments have been the backbone of Mr. Kennedy's program. The list adds up to almost total failure for what undoubtedly will be known as the Three Empty Years.

With the Democrats in control of the White House and every Government agency and with a 2-to-1 majority in the Senate and a 3-to-2 majority in the House of Representatives Mr. Kennedy can have no alibi. Any censure of Congress is a censure of the Democrat Party and of the lack of Presidential leadership.

**Managed News**

*March 28, 1963*

By Senator Dirksen

For 6 months now a controversy has raged over the efforts of the Kennedy administration to manage the news. We agree there have been efforts, in fact crude efforts, to manipulate the news from Washington, but the issue has become much deeper than that.

The deplorable fact is that today millions of Americans believe their Government is not telling them the whole truth. The record of the administration since it took office encourages that belief.

It spent its first year trying to prove that its defeats in Congress were actually victories. White House aids assembled the press to convince them 33 major triumphs had been won in the first 100 days compared to only 12 under Eisenhower and a measly 11 under Franklin D. Roosevelt in comparable periods.

A Bay of Pigs disaster was followed by a tractors-for-Castro citizens project which the White House disowned for 2 days and then finally admitted it had sponsored from the beginning. Secretary of Defense McNamara admitted that the much vaunted missile gap issue of the 1960 Presidential campaign was false; that it was the Russians who were on the short end of the gap all along.

The American people had to learn from Moscow, not Washington, that the Kennedy administration was exploring U.S. recognition of and a U.N. seat for Communist Outer Mongolia, a seat which the Mongols finally acquired.

A Republican Senator, Kenneth Keating of New York, had to alert the American people there were Soviet missiles in Cuba, a fact which for weeks was denied by the Kennedy administration from the President down. When the administration finally confirmed the facts on October 14, 1962, its spokesmen still denied them for another week on the grounds they must not let the Russians know what the Russians already knew and what Senator Keating had been saying for 6 weeks—that there were Soviet missiles in Cuba.

These are only some of the acorns of deception from which the mighty oak of doubt has sprung. Representative Halleck will cite others.
March 28, 1963

By Representative Halleck

The controversy over managed news was a product of the Cuban crisis last year and it is little wonder that it still continues. Today President Kennedy says there can't be a blockade of Cuba because it would be an act of war, yet on last October 22, during the missile crisis, Secretary of Defense McNamara told newsmen that any ship approaching Cuba, which did not stop on U.S. orders, would be shot out of the water. That is a blockade.

The American people were told the missile removal would be internationally supervised; meaning by the U.N. When that didn't materialize the Washington news managers talked of Red Cross inspection. Finally an estimated 42 missiles were removed under a window-peeking inspection program operated by our own ships and planes that leaves unanswered to this day whether all the missiles were removed.

In the Cuban negotiations, Khrushchev demanded that our missiles be removed from Turkey. The American people were told Khrushchev's demand had been rejected and as late as November 11, 1962, Deputy Secretary of Defense Gilpatric was denying publicly that our Turkish-based missiles would be withdrawn. Yet only 2 months later on January 28, the American people learned not from Washington, but from Ankara, that in fact our missiles were being withdrawn from Turkey.

The record for truth is no better on the domestic front. On the eve of the congressional elections last year, Secretary of Labor Wirtz issued a set of phony job figures for the electorate. He said 4,500,000 more Americans had jobs since Kennedy took office. A month later he admitted that the actual increase was only 1,200,000, or approximately a normal increase. On election eve he said unemployment had been reduced by over 2 million. The truth was the figure was a third that size.

We have offered only a partial list of the Kennedy administration's failures to level with the American people. For an administration which says it favors truth in advertising, truth in securities, truth in packaging, truth in interest rates, and truth in TV ratings, we suggest it also consider a project for truth in Government.

(This addendum was released with Senator Dirksen's and Representative Halleck's statements of March 28, 1963.)

When Secretary of Defense McNamara participated in the Pentagon's 2-hour nationwide telethon on Cuba, February 6, 1963, he said he had "no evidence that Cuba was being used as a base for subversion directed against other Latin American countries." Less than 2 weeks later CIA Director John McConi said that "Fidel Castro is spurring and supporting the efforts of Communists and other revolutionary elements to overthrow and seize control of governments of Latin America" and gave numerous examples of Cuban exportation of subversion over the previous year.

When Republicans (Senator Dirksen and Governor Rockefeller) on August 8, 1962, contended nuclear test ban con-
cessions were about to be made, the administration denied it and claimed the discussions only involved technical improvements in detection. On August 27 the United States proposed elimination of the so-called threshold of detection provision which Senator Dodd, Democrat of Connecticut, later called the most serious of our many departures from principle.

When on March 9, 1963, Senator Goldwater, Republican of Arizona, asked if plans were in the making to burn 30 B-47 bombers and 30 Russian Badger bombers the information was flatly disputed by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, but 2 days later Secretary of State Rusk admitted the plans existed and were under study.

The highly varied statements by the White House and USIA on prestige polls over the past 2 years rival a jigsaw puzzle. After releasing the disputed USIA polls that figured in the 1960 campaign, the USIA announced it was banning prestige polls, subsequently the President said polls existed, later the White House denied this, then USIA denied it, then USIA said polls did exist but were confidential, then USIA promulgated "Murrow's law" where polls could not be released except at 1- or 2-year intervals and finally violated "Murrow's law" by making available a month-old poll on March 14 purporting to show U.S. prestige high.

In his speech nationally televised August 13, 1962, President Kennedy said the 87th Congress was the "real key" to combating recession and listed a number of results of its enactments, including the statement that "400,000 men and women are now receiving retraining." As Representative Goodell, Republican of New York, a coauthor of the Manpower Retraining Act, pointed out on August 17, the program was not yet even in operation.

Despite the fact that the Kerr-Mills Act providing medical aid for the aged is the law of the land, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which is promoting the President's medicare program chose to ignore the Kerr-Mills Act in its 16 page annual report, except for a small paragraph noting that 18 more States had joined the program. Representative Byrnes of Wisconsin, ranking Republican on the House Ways and Means Committee, declared that HEW was deliberately keeping the Kerr-Mills program in a vacuum and "has not only been dragging its feet on encouraging State participation * * * but has actually put stumbling blocks in the way of its success."

On March 6, 1963, in his news conference President Kennedy, answering questions about GOP proposals to cut his alltime recordbreaking budget, said "I think we made a hard budget." He added he wanted to know "where they are going to cut it and who was liable to be adversely affected by it." Twelve days later on March 18 the White House announced the President had reduced the budget by $125,742,000 since it had been sent to Congress.
February 28, 1963

By Senator Dirksen

The United States has engaged in 403 negotiating sessions over a 5-year period with the Soviet Union on a nuclear test ban and we are told the Kennedy administration intends to continue the negotiations.

The 2 years of Kennedy administration negotiations have been marked by a parade of concessions to the Soviet Union to the point that we think American prestige is at stake.

In its very first negotiating session on March 21, 1961, the Kennedy administration made seven major concessions to the Soviet Union. Two months later it dropped the number of onsite inspections previously demanded by the United States from 20 to 12. Last December it dropped the number to eight. On January 16, 1962, it bowed to Soviet demands to merge nuclear test ban negotiations with general disarmament discussions. Last August it reduced the U.S. demand for 21 monitoring stations in the Soviet Union to 8. Then, with little regard for the Soviet record of duplicity, the Kennedy administration proposed that the monitoring stations in each nation be manned only by its own nationals; in other words, it would be up to the Soviets to report Soviet cheating.

This is only a partial list of the concessions. The only result to date has been a Soviet violation of the voluntary test ban which reputedly has further narrowed the margin of U.S. superiority in nuclear weapons.

Now there are reports from Geneva the Kennedy administration is considering lowering the number of onsite inspections to seven or even five. This has become an exercise not in negotiation but in giveaway.

The record is unmistakably clear. A policy of firmness, not concession, is the only course that produces results in dealing with the Soviet Union.

On 10 previous occasions during these last 2 years the Joint Senate-House Republican leadership has made statements on the nuclear test ban negotiations protesting the lack of a firm policy on the part of the Kennedy administration on this vital question.

We think it is high time to call a halt to concessions.

June 13, 1963

By Representative Halleck

Negotiations with the Soviet Union on a test ban treaty are now 5 years old, there have been 403 negotiating sessions and the only product has been an endless display of Soviet stalling, Soviet duplicity, and Soviet treachery.

Only a year ago President Kennedy was calling his experience with Soviet double-dealing on the test ban a lesson. On March 2, 1962, Mr. Kennedy, in a television address to the American people, said:

We know enough now about broken negotiations, secret preparations, and the (Soviet) advantage gained from a long test series never to offer again an uninspected moratorium.
Yet, on Monday of this week Mr. Kennedy not only declared the United States bound to an un inspected moratorium on testing but he did so without even a commitment from the Soviets to join in it. It is evident that Mr. Kennedy has not only forgotten his lesson, but he is now settling for half as much as existed from 1958 to 1961 when the Soviets were a party to a moratorium.

We know that most experts think Red China will have nuclear warheads in a year or so. Does the Kennedy decision take this into consideration? Does his decision mean that all preparations for testing have been dropped?

In the past 2 and a half years, we, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, have protested on 11 occasions Mr. Kennedy's course of concession after concession to the Soviets in the nuclear test ban negotiations while receiving nothing in return. And we have not been alone. Leading Democrats, including Senators Russell of Georgia, Dodd of Connecticut, Symington of Missouri, and Jackson of Washington, and Representative Holifield of California, have done likewise.

But we must say that the President's latest course, the adoption of a self-imposed moratorium, is the most doubtful act of all. Two rounds of Soviet testing since September 1961 have dangerously narrowed our margin of nuclear superiority, if not wiped it out. To gamble with national security now for a piece of paper that at best would represent only a shadow of the original proposed agreement is sheer folly.

(See Senator Dirksen's statement June 13, 1963, p. 16.)

July 11, 1963

By Representative Halleck

Nuclear test ban negotiations will be resumed next week, this time in Moscow. With the record already showing 408 negotiating sessions over a 5-year period, it must be said that never has so much time been spent accomplishing so little.

The Kennedy administration's deplorable history of concessions to the Soviet Union on this issue has caused widespread fear that the Moscow meetings may end in virtual surrender by our negotiators. Because underground testing would still be permitted, there is grave doubt that anything can be accomplished by a treaty or that the nuclear arms race would be retarded in any significant way. Nor is there the slightest basis for putting any faith in the spoken or written word of the leaders of world communism.

In Bonn, Germany, last month, Mr. Kennedy attempted to justify the continued negotiations on the ground that other nations would soon be building arsenals of nuclear weapons and he said this could be a disaster. Yet neither the President nor anyone else has been able to explain how a treaty between the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union will stop France and Red China, or any other nation, from going ahead with a nuclear weapons program if they so desire.

Our relations with NATO countries are not being helped by the latest Russian demand for inclusion of a nonaggression pact with a test ban treaty. This only sharpens the fears of our European
allies that the United States might barter away Western Europe's long-range interests.

Finally, there is the very real fear on the part of some of our top scientists that Russian tests over the last 2 years have jeopardized if not erased our margin of superiority in nuclear weapons. Even if a meaningful test ban becomes possible, these scientists want to see us make up this lost ground.

One thing is certain: Any agreement susceptible to cheating and which fails to include adequate inspection would be far more tragic than no agreement at all. It would be a waste of time for our negotiators to bring home a phantom treaty because the Congress would never accept it.

August 2, 1963

By the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership

A treaty for a nuclear test ban is in the interest of every American if it can be had without endangering our safety or security.

The goal of any civilized people should be peace. This is infinitely more true today than ever before because of nuclear weapons.

With the initialing of a partial test ban treaty draft by the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union, the American people and their Government face a critical decision—

Which will do most to preserve peace in the world:

Ratification of a limited treaty placing selective restraints on the development of nuclear weapons, or,

A maximum up-to-the-minute defense capability so destructive as to prohibit attack?

This is the issue. And it is a very, very complex issue. It cannot be safely resolved by an emotional approach; it must be weighed on the scales of hard fact.

The treaty draft itself raises many questions. The treaty has best been described by the President when he very properly told the Nation what it would not do.

The treaty will not, Mr. Kennedy said, "mean an end to the threat of nuclear war." "It will not," he said, "reduce nuclear stockpiles; it will not halt the production of nuclear weapons; it will not restrict their use in time of war."

It will not, Mr. Kennedy added, "reduce our need for arms." It will not "reduce foreign aid." It will not "cause the Communists to forgo their ambitions, or eliminate the danger of war."

This is a long, very long list of things which the President says the treaty will not do. It should be memorized by every American.

Then what will the treaty do? In the President's words "it is an important first step, a step toward peace, a step toward reason, a step away from war." These words also deserve the thoughtful consideration of every American. Certainly it is the sworn duty of every Member of the U.S. Senate to determine if this first step is a step in the right direction before voting for or against ratification of the treaty.

The essence of this first step is the prohibition in the treaty against further nuclear testing underwater, in the atmosphere, and in outer space. The signatories are free to test underground.

This brings us to the core of the issue.
On September 1, 1961, the Soviet Union, following many months of clandestine preparations, probably including underground testing, abruptly broke the voluntary test ban which had been in effect since October 1958, and began extensive high-altitude testing of multimegaton bombs, finally exploding one approximately twice the size of any yet tested by the United States.

There is also evidence that during these tests the Soviets may have made progress in developing an antiballistic missile capable of destroying incoming missiles. Also to be considered are published reports that the Soviets are now erecting launching sites which may be designed for these antiballistic weapons.

Prior to this series of Soviet tests, there was general agreement that the United States enjoyed superiority over the Soviet Union in the broad range of nuclear weaponry, with a far greater variety of weapons possessed by us, and certainly a marked superiority in the smaller tactical nuclear weapons for ground warfare. Because our entire strategy for world peace was based on this nuclear supremacy, our margin was vital, as it was when the original recommendation for a limited suspension of nuclear testing was made by the previous administration.

Today there is doubt that the former American superiority exists to the same degree. The Soviet superbomb margin is generally conceded, with Soviet capability in the antiballistic missile field suspected. Both are the product of atmospheric testing which would be forbidden under the pending nuclear test ban treaty.

On the other hand, American superiority in the category of tactical or smaller nuclear weapons presumably could be overcome by Soviet underground testing which is permitted under the test ban treaty.

In short, the treaty forbids testing in categories where the Soviets are ahead, but permits testing in categories in which the Soviets are behind. The United States is foreclosed from making the necessary atmospheric tests to remedy any lag in strategic nuclear weapons on which the world balance of power may depend today. Thus two very real questions are posed:

1. Would the test ban treaty permit the Soviet Union to overcome any margin remaining to the United States and eventually establish a marked superiority?

2. If Soviet superiority were gained, would the peace of the world be in safer hands than when the United States enjoyed the edge?

We realize that President Kennedy, with all the vast sources of information at his command, must have weighed these possibilities with the greatest gravity. And he made his decision in favor of the test ban treaty.

Now the question of ratification faces the Senate. Surely the Members of the Senate should have every bit of information necessary to arrive at their decision.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff and other important members of the Armed Services command, top officials in the Atomic Energy Commission, nuclear experts in and out of Government, and intelligence officers, in addition to State Department spokesmen, all should be called by the appropriate committees for an evaluation of the effects of the treaty, with all cards face up on the table.
It is essential that members of the U.S. Senate have the opportunity to reach their judgment on the test ban treaty with sufficient information to assure a course that is best for America, best for the free world.

*August 16, 1963*

By the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership

Any time a nation reaches an agreement or makes a treaty with the Soviet Union, the question immediately arises: How much is any agreement with the Soviets worth? The answer, based on the Soviet Union's unbelievable record of treaty violations, has to be that any agreement is highly suspect.

The Senate of the United States is now weighing proposed ratification of the partial test ban treaty with the Soviet Union which President Kennedy regards as a first step toward relaxing world tension.

Premier Khrushchev claims the same goal and proposes that, in addition to the test ban treaty, the nations of the East and West sign a nonaggression pact to create a fresh international climate for a solution of major problems of our time, including disarmament.

The record of the Soviet Union in adhering to its nonaggression pacts is nothing short of disgraceful. For example:

On September 28, 1926, the Soviet Union signed a nonaggression pact with Lithuania. Soviet troops invaded Lithuania June 15, 1940, and annexed the country 2 months later.

On January 21, 1932, the Soviet Union signed a nonaggression pact with Finland. On November 30, 1939, Soviet military forces invaded Finland.

On February 5, 1932, the Soviet Union signed a nonaggression pact with Latvia. On June 16, 1940, Soviet troops invaded Latvia and 2 months later annexed the country.

On May 4, 1932, the Soviet Union signed a nonaggression pact with Estonia. On June 16, 1940, Soviet military forces occupied Estonia and 2 months later the Soviets annexed the country.

On July 25, 1932, the Soviet Union signed a nonaggression pact with Poland. On September 17, 1939, following the Soviet-Nazi pact, Soviet troops invaded Poland and on September 29, 1939, the Soviet Union signed a treaty with Nazi Germany to partition Poland.

On August 21, 1937, the Soviet Union signed a nonaggression pact with the Nationalist Government of China. On October 2, 1949, the Soviet Union broke relations with Nationalist China after recognizing the Chinese Communist regime it had helped to gain power by supplying arms, ammunition, food, and money.

An exhaustive study by the staff of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security made in 1959, involving nearly a thousand Soviet treaties and agreements, was summarized in this fashion:

The staff found that in the 38 short years since the Soviet Union came into existence, its Government had broken its word to virtually every country to which it ever gave a signed promise. It signed treaties of nonaggression with neighboring states and then absorbed those states. It signed promises to refrain from revolutionary activity inside the
countries with which it sought friendship, and then cynically broke those promises. It was violating the first agreement it ever signed with the United States at the very moment the Soviet envoy, Litvinov, was putting his signature to that agreement, and is still violating the same agreement * * * It broke the promises it made to the Western nations during previous meetings at the summit in Teheran and Yalta. It broke lend-lease agreements offered to it by the United States in order to keep Stalin from surrendering to the Nazis. It violated the Charter of the United Nations. It keeps no international promises at all unless doing so is clearly advantageous to the Soviet Union.

It should be clear to the free world that Mr. Khrushchev’s second step proposal for a nonaggression pact is not very attractive when the record of the Soviet Union on agreements is examined.

We believe that the United States should take the initiative and demand from the Soviet Union a demonstration of good faith.

At President Kennedy’s February 7, 1963, press conference it was pointed out Khrushchev had said Soviet troops would be removed from Cuba “in due course.” The President was asked if he felt he had a commitment from Khrushchev and he replied:

I have read a statement of Mr. Khrushchev that these forces would be removed in due course or due time. The time was not stated and, therefore, we are trying to get a more satisfactory definition.

On May 9, 1963, the Stennis subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee estimated the number of Russian troops in Cuba at 17,500 and called the figure minimum. So far as can be learned no significant reduction has been made in the Soviet forces since.

We suggest here is the basis for an American proposal for a so-called second step. We propose that President Kennedy request Premier Khrushchev to withdraw all Soviet troops from Cuba, in line with Khrushchev’s own promise earlier this year and in keeping with his repeated statements calling for a relaxation of East-West tensions.

It is to be recalled that Khrushchev himself said the signing of the partial test ban treaty in Moscow represented “first sprouts of international confidence” and he added “the Soviet Government will continue doing everything in its power for these sprouts to develop and gain in strength.”

Here is Premier Khrushchev’s opportunity to help the “first sprouts” grow substantially by only doing what he had already promised to do—withdraw Soviet forces from Cuba. Such a step by the Soviet Union would have far more meaning in the free world than a nonaggression pact because it would be concrete action. It would be welcomed by the peoples of the world, doubly so by the nations of the Western Hemisphere.
POLITICAL OUTLOOK FOR 1964

Speaking for the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, Senator Thruston B. Morton, chairman of the Republican Senatorial Committee and Representative Bob Wilson, chairman of the Republican Congressional Committee, made the following statements at a Leadership press conference.

May 9, 1963

By Senator Morton

The members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership met this morning to explore the political situation and Senator Dirksen and Representative Halleck have asked Representative Wilson and me, as chairmen respectively of the House and Senate Campaign Committees, to express some of the conclusions reached.

First, there was remarkable agreement that the political climate is shifting away from the Democrats and toward the Republicans at a rate that makes a Republican victory in 1964 far more likely than a few months ago.

Second, it was the consensus that the Kennedy administration is slipping steadily in public esteem because the New Frontier promised so much but has accomplished so little. There is a growing distrust of President Kennedy's outmoded spending theories and a genuine disappointment in his handling of foreign relations.

There is evidence the Democrats are beginning to realize that public disillusionment with Mr. Kennedy has set in. Only recently my distinguished counterpart, Senator Magnuson, chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, made a very frank appraisal of his party's chances for Senate seats next year.

He regards only 7 out of 25 Democratic-held Senate seats as safe, and concedes that 7: Burdick of North Dakota; Hart of Michigan; Hartke of Indiana; McGee of Wyoming; Moss of Utah; Yarbrough of Texas; and Young of Ohio, will be "tough, real tough" to recapture. Senator Magnuson feels that the odds favor most of the other 11 Democratic seats in contest, but our reports indicate that quite a few of these Democrats belong on the "tough, real tough" list also.

It is obvious that the Kennedy administration has lost a lot of steam and much of its glamour in its first 27 months. The easy solutions promised in the 1960 campaign simply are not coming to pass. We feel that the increasing optimism of Republican leaders and workers is fully justified.

May 9, 1963

By Representative Bob Wilson

1963 is a year of resurgence for the Republican Party. The current week provides three examples:

The election of Ted McKeldin as Republican mayor of Baltimore; the election of a Republican mayor and 5 city councilmen in High Point, N.C., after 20 solid years of Democratic reign; and the Republican sweep of 8 out of 10 town elections in the State of Connecticut.

Earlier this year, we picked up 12 Florida legislative seats and elected a mayor in St. Petersburg. Our party made substantial gains in such Democratic strongholds as Chicago; North Augusta, S.C.; Charleston, W. Va.; Fort Worth, Tex., and Kansas City, Mo.
We welcome these advances. I mention them because a sound party base at the city and local level helps elect Congressmen and Presidents. We particularly welcome Mr. McKeldin’s election because it demonstrated that President Kennedy’s personal radio and TV endorsements which were continuously broadcast throughout the Baltimore campaign proved ineffective.

In 1964 a confused Democratic congressional majority which has failed miserably must face the voters. So will the Kennedy administration which has made a shambles of financial responsibility, lowered U.S. prestige abroad, recognized communism as a fixture in the Western Hemisphere, and lost ground steadily in the cold war. There has been an effort by the New Frontiersmen to manipulate the news to cover up the whole Kennedy mess.

It is obvious the public is becoming increasingly aware of this deception. No amount of camouflage can permanently mask Mr. Kennedy’s failure. This has already been demonstrated at the congressional level by the election of Republican Don Clausen in California’s First District earlier this year to a seat formerly held by a Democrat.

With an expanding base at State and local levels, with the decline and deterioration of the New Frontier, we, as Republicans, look forward to 1964 with confidence and a zest for the forthcoming elections. We are certain that we will realize heavy gains in the House of Representatives and elect Republicans from the White House to the courthouse.

---

**Spending**

*February 28, 1963*

By Representative Halleck

President Kennedy is in his third year in the White House and he has already set a record that few will envy. He has become the greatest spender of public moneys in the history of the world at peace or war.

Mr. Kennedy also has set another record. He has incurred, or projected, more than $27 billion in deficit spending which means that in red ink alone he has already exceeded the entire cost of Federal Government for the first 127 years of this Nation’s existence, a span covering Presidents from George Washington to Woodrow Wilson.

But this is not all. The President proposes to incur $12 billion of this deficit accumulation in the next fiscal year by reducing taxes $10 billion while increasing Federal spending $4.5 billion. To most Americans there is something dangerously wrong about the Federal Government going further into debt so it can cut taxes while increasing Federal spending. We Republicans agree.

We have taken three steps to do something about it:

1. Our members of the House Appropriations Committee have set up a task force headed by Representative Frank Bow of Ohio to propose cuts in Mr. Kennedy’s alltime high budget.

2. Former President Eisenhower's Budget Director, Maurice Stans, has joined the task force as an adviser.

3. Republican members of the Senate Appropriations Committee have met with Mr. Stans and are being kept advised of the preliminary studies.
This is not going to be a partisan effort. Many Democratic Members of Congress are just as disturbed as we are, and so are millions of Americans.

The President says we must have a tax cut to avoid a recession. Of course, everybody would like to see taxes cut. But we think the American people should express themselves on this critical issue by writing their Senators and Representatives in Congress stating whether they favor or oppose cutting taxes without cutting spending. Never has it been so important for the American people to speak up and be heard.

(See Joint Leadership statement of December 20, p. 45.)

March 19, 1963

By Representative Halleck

President Kennedy’s unprecedented proposal for us to borrow our way into a tax cut and, at the same time, increase Federal spending, has the American people deeply disturbed. They would be even more disturbed if they understood what the Kennedy program is going to do to our national debt.

Mr. Kennedy is deliberately advocating a “planned” deficit of $12 billion. This means that the U.S. Treasury will have to borrow at least $12 billion more directly from the American people or from commercial banks to pay the Kennedy administration’s bills. Therefore, the national debt limit will have to be increased by Congress from $308 billion to around $320 or $325 billion.

The Kennedy administration claims these proposals will “increase the purchasing power” of individuals while “not raising the threat of inflation.” We insist this is a virtual impossibility under a deficit budget.

If the $12 billion is borrowed directly from the American people, then their purchasing power will be reduced by a similar amount. If, instead, the money is borrowed from commercial banks, then bank credit will have been expanded by $12 billion and a potential inflationary threat will have been created.

We feel that the Kennedy fiscal program instead of helping the economy is more likely to create a dangerous economic stalemate.

We Republicans cannot put a stamp of approval on such a gamble with its accompanying increase in the national debt. That is why we have set up a task force to recommend reductions in Federal spending in an effort to avoid deficit financing and to make a tax cut have a real and favorable impact on the American economy.

If the Kennedy administration and the Democratic Members in Congress insist on pursuing planned deficit financing, then we must serve notice they have no assurance that Republicans will vote to increase the debt limit.
Statement by Governor Clifford P. Hansen, of Wyoming, at a Dirksen-Halleck news conference following a meeting of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership which the Governor also attended:

*March 28, 1963*

By Governor Hansen

I want to thank the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership for inviting me to participate with them in this news conference and in their meeting earlier this morning. I believe the Leadership has taken very sound and effective positions on the issues confronting this country over the past 2 years and it was an honor to join in their deliberations today.

I want to speak to the problem of Federal-State relationship as it exists today, certainly in my State of Wyoming, and I think in every other State in this Union. We are witnessing a rapidly increasing encroachment by the Federal Government into the rights and affairs of the States and local communities. Wyoming, with 52 percent of its land already owned by the Federal Government, is keenly aware of this problem. We do not believe that all the solutions to our problems must come from Washington.

In the 70 years of Wyoming’s existence it has never had an unbalanced budget. It has no bonded debt. One-third of the appropriations for this year’s budget in Wyoming will be spent on higher education. We have just enacted legislation implementing the Kerr-Mills Act to provide medical assistance for our senior citizens, which we regard as a sound program.

Although we are only the 48th State in population, we are the 16th in per capita income. Our unemployment is below the national average.

It might interest you to know that we have a law which forbids Wyoming accepting certain Federal grants for education unless the Federal budget is in balance.

Now, when I say to you that the people of Wyoming are not enthusiastic about an increase in Federal spending accompanied by tax reduction and a $12 billion deficit, I think you can understand why.

We are very hopeful that this Congress will do everything in its power to drastically curtail Federal spending so that the American people can enjoy a real tax cut that will stimulate our economy and make more jobs. Commonsense and our own experience tells us it can be done no other way.

*April 9, 1963*

By Representative Halleck

The House of Representatives last week witnessed an example of political bludgeoning by the Kennedy administration that is without parallel in the history of this Republic. It entailed listing in the Congressional Record literally thousands of Federal projects which, the House was told, would have to be eliminated if the Members attempted to cut President Kennedy’s recordbreaking spending proposals.

The list of projects took 15½ pages of the Congressional Record and was distributed to newsmen in a 133-page press release. It is doubtful if a more arbitrary or deceptive list could be made. It is
doubtful if the bureaucrats in the Federal Government ever before engaged in such a cheap political stunt or ever wasted more man-hours and public money in doing it. It is plain that every department of the executive branch took part in drafting these outrageous lists to force increased Federal spending whether the taxpayers want it or not.

Each of the thousands of projects was deliberately chosen, not because it was the best place to cut the budget, but because some politicians in the executive branch thought it might intimidate Members of Congress. Well, let's take a look at one of these phony cuts and see what kind of game is being played here:

Prorating an imaginary 15 percent cut throughout the budget, the Democratic leaders announced 14 offices in 14 major cities in as many States would have to be closed down by the Small Business Administration to meet its allotted $30 million reduction. If anyone will look on page 301 of the Federal budget you will find a $42 million increase in the Small Business Administration's loan revolving fund out of which the entire imaginary $30 million cut could have been taken. Even with this reduction the fund would still have had $12 million more than it has ever had in its history.

We have already had one sample of the moral climate of this administration in its efforts to manipulate the news. Now we have another sample, an effort to blackjack Members of Congress into supporting unnecessary Federal spending. It's about time everyone took a second look at the New Frontier.

April 9, 1963

By Senator Dirksen

It is perhaps no coincidence that on the same day the House Democratic leaders were initiating Congress into the Kennedy administration's game of intimidating economy-minded members, the Senate was given a similar example of New Frontier ethics.

The occasion was the consideration of the President's so-called mass transit legislation, a program that will cost the Federal Government $9 billion if it costs it a dime. The bald purpose of the statement I am about to quote was to serve notice on Southern, Midwestern, and Western Senators that unless they supported the mass transit bill, the Eastern Senators might not vote for bills they wanted. Listen while I quote:

If votes are withheld by States that have little or no present need for Federal funds for commuters, where do these States expect to find support for their own urgent needs? *** If State benefit becomes the test, where will the votes be found to reclaim the lands of the vast Southwest; to develop the mighty power potential of the Northwest; to provide rural electrification for the Southeast; to insure farm income in the Midwest?

Those are the words of Senator Ribicoff of Connecticut, a former member of President Kennedy's Cabinet, made on the Senate floor April 2.

Should multibillion programs be considered by the U.S. Senate on their merit? Or should Senators knuckle under for fear of retaliation from certain eastern Senators? Should an alltime record $99 billion budget be examined for cuts and possible economies? Or should
Members of Congress knuckle under for fear of retaliation from the executive branch?

Yes, it is time the American people asked themselves: What kind of moral climate has sprung up in Washington under the New Frontier? We have already heard one top White House adviser publicly belittle the Puritan ethic. On the basis of events in the Senate and House on April 2, perhaps the New Frontier has finally forged something new; the Impuritan ethic.

Representative Melvin R. Laird was a guest of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership at the press conference of April 9, 1963, and made the following statement:

April 9, 1963

By Representative Laird

Speaking as a member of the task force of the House Appropriations Committee, we have set a goal to reduce the President's request for new obligatory authority which was submitted to this Congress in the amount of $108 billion. We, in the minority, feel this can be reduced by $10 to $15 billion.

As one of the first steps in this reduction I proposed in the House Appropriations Committee on Friday a cut in the first supplemental appropriation bill of $500 million.

We, in the minority, feel that the No. 1 priority as far as getting this country's economy moving again is in the area of tax reduction. And if we are going to be serious and talk seriously about tax reduction, it is necessary for us to make cuts in the President's proposed $108 billion in new obligatory authority.

As a first step it is our hope that the members of the majority party will join with us in the vote today and tomorrow to reduce this supplemental bill by $500 million. We feel there is a question of priority in this year 1963 and that the No. 1 priority, as far as our economy is concerned, is in the area of tax reduction and not in the area of increased Federal spending. Last year the Kennedy administration used the avenue of increased Federal spending and there was a Federal budget deficit of over $8 billion. This year we feel it is necessary for us to make substantial reductions in this budget and we feel this is a step in the right direction. It is our hope that we will be successful.

We may not be successful in reaching the goal of a $10 to $15 billion cut in new obligatory authority. But we in the minority have a responsibility to build a record and to show how cuts can be made. We hope we will be successful on some of these votes but it will take help from the majority party.

But we will build a record showing how this budget can be reduced from $10 to $15 billion in new obligatory authority.

June 27, 1963

By Senator Dirksen

Next Monday, July 1, will mark the beginning of a new fiscal year during which the Federal Government plans to cut taxes while spending more money than it ever spent before, either in peace or at war. Only one of two things could change this plan:

1. President Kennedy could revise his budget downward to avoid the $12 billion deficit he has planned, or
2. The Congress could redouble its efforts to reduce the amount of spending authority the President has sought.

When Mr. Kennedy submitted his record-breaking budget last January, he justified it on the grounds that it would prevent a recession which his economic advisers were forecasting. In the 6 months since, those forecasts have been proven wrong by an improvement in virtually every economic indicator which the Government itself releases. Personal income, industrial output, new orders, retail sales, and plant investment, for example, all are up. Government officials, leading economists, and business leaders are now forecasting a high economic level well into 1964 and beyond. Even cartoonists are reflecting the spirit of things, as witness Bill Mauldin of the Chicago Sun-Times who recently depicted the sun shining brilliantly on a NewFrontiersman standing in a raincoat trying to sell umbrellas marked "tax cut."

The strongest support for Mr. Kennedy's tax reduction program has come from the Business Committee for a Tax Cut which is headed by Mr. Henry Ford. But Mr. Ford has also now called for a reduction in Federal spending to at least the current level.

Although the new fiscal year starts next Monday the Congress has already authorized the executive branch to continue for 60 days expenditures on a comparable basis to a year ago. Thus, plenty of time remains for constructive action.

We, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, believe all Americans would applaud if President Kennedy, in view of improved economic conditions, voluntarily recommended to Congress substantial reductions in his budgeted expenditures. Certainly if logic compelled proposals for increased spending under January's conditions, then the same logic demands reductions under conditions that exist today.

June 27, 1963

By Representative Halleck

There can be no doubt that President Kennedy's proposal to cut taxes while increasing Federal spending is against the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the American people. This has been twice proven:

First, when Mr. Kennedy was speculating about a tax cut last year a Gallup poll published on August 1, 1962, showed 72 percent of the American people were opposed to a tax cut if it meant increasing the national debt.

Second, when Mr. Kennedy in January of this year formally proposed a $10 billion tax reduction with a "planned" $12 billion deficit, the Congress was flooded with mail opposing a tax cut unless spending was also cut.

We Republicans set up a task force in the House of Representatives to study budget cuts. So far seven regular appropriations bills for the fiscal year starting Monday have been passed by the House with reductions in appropriations or spending authority totaling $3.2 billion.

These cuts have been made by a united Republican effort and leadership with the help of some Democrats, seeking to put some sense into Mr. Kennedy's budget. But we have had White House opposition every inch of the way. Let me give you an example.

The White House filled the Congressional Record with hundreds of imaginary budget cuts, and listed projects and programs which would supposedly be closed down. One of these imaginary cuts, a $30 mil-
lion one, was supposed to shut down Small Business Administration offices in Chicago, Atlanta, St. Louis, Philadelphia, Providence, Portland, Oreg., and eight other cities. On April 9, we suggested no office would close if the Small Business Administration took a look at its loan fund, and the agency has since voluntarily cut its loan authorization request by, not an imaginary $30 million, but a real $50 million with no damage done.

If Mr. Kennedy would take a serious look at his entire recordbreaking budget, we are convinced he could reduce it by billions of dollars without loss of any essential Government services. Then everybody, including Congress and the American people, could consider a tax cut in good conscience.

August 22, 1963

By Representative Halleck

In again urging the Kennedy administration to cut Federal spending, we also want to suggest a course of more circumspect Federal bookkeeping. For 3 years now the American people have been given examples of savings in Federal spending and reductions in this or that which would cause the Federal Trade Commission to issue cease and desist orders if claimed by American free enterprise in its advertising.

Only last month the administration announced that its projected $8 billion deficit for the past fiscal year had been reduced to only $6 billion largely by hurried sales of Government-held mortgages and other assets. This could be compared to jumping out of the 60th floor of the Empire State Building instead of the 80th.

A couple of weeks later the Treasury Department revised its projected $12 billion deficit for the current fiscal year to $9 billion, with 322 days of the year yet to come. This is the same Treasury Department that predicted a $500 million surplus at the beginning of the past fiscal year, revised it after the November 1962 election to an $8 billion deficit half through the year, and then to $6 billion at the end of the year. Its present forecasts can be judged accordingly.

Also last month, the Secretary of Defense announced he had saved $1 billion during fiscal 1963 which seems wonderful until you look at the Defense Department’s 1963 budget which was $2 billion higher than the year before. It recalls Secretary Ribicoff’s paper saving of $100 million in HEW before he ran for the Senate in 1962, a year however that saw HEW’s budget increase $300 million.

We think the American people have seen enough of these paper reductions, these phantom savings by the Kennedy administration. Everybody, certainly the American people and probably the Kennedy administration, too, would be better off if there were some real dollar savings made in the Federal establishment.

August 22, 1963

Additional Remarks by Representative Halleck

The President’s letter to the House Ways and Means Committee yesterday was an astounding document. He says that if Congress will reduce taxes, he, the President, will tighten spending.

It is a matter of record that we Republicans have for months been demanding that the administration cut spending before taxes were cut and the House of Representatives has made a sincere effort to
cut spending, having thus far brought about a reduction of more than $3 billion.

But all we get is opposition from the administration. We make a cut in the Defense appropriation and Secretary of Defense McNamara moves heaven and earth to get the cut restored in the Senate. We cut the Post Office Department’s appropriation, and the Postmaster General reduces mail deliveries to force a restoration of the cut. In fact, that has been the pattern: The House, over the objections of administration spokesmen, cuts appropriations and the administration uses every leverage at its command to restore the cuts in the Senate.

From the viewpoint of the House of Representatives, I would say that it would be reasonable for Mr. Kennedy to perform now instead of promising what he will do later.

---

**Task Force, GOP**

*December 20, 1963*

By the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership

On February 8, 1963, the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, with all 11 leaders signing, issued its initial statement on the new legislative year. After examining the economic recommendations of the Kennedy administration, which included a proposal for a $10 billion tax cut, a $4.5 billion increase in Federal spending, and a planned $12 billion deficit, the Joint Leadership declared:

The Republican goal in this Congress will be a reduction in Federal spending which can lead to a reasonable tax cut. It can be done, because we have done it. The only two major tax cuts in the last 30 years were enacted by Republican Congresses and both times we cut spending substantially.

We suggest to the President that full employment is much more likely by this historically sound method, than by deficit financing which has never achieved full employment yet. Despite the fact we are outnumbered 2 to 1 in the Senate and 3 to 2 in the House, we shall strive for this sound objective in the conviction that the unemployed are only being duped by the administration’s proposals.

The Government can help solve unemployment by encouraging industry and investment capital to promote expansion and new ventures. It can help by convincing workers, consumers, and small business that inflation is not ahead. Chronic Government deficits will never stimulate American ingenuity, build confidence, or create jobs.

On February 28, the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership approved an announcement by Mr. Halleck that we had “taken three steps” to encourage a reduction in spending so a tax cut would be possible:

1. Our members of the House Appropriations Committee have set up a task force headed by Representative Frank Bow, of Ohio, to propose cuts in Mr. Kennedy’s alltime high budget.
2. Former President Eisenhower’s Budget Director, Maurice Stans, has joined the task force as an adviser.
3. Republican members of the Senate Appropriations Committee have met with Mr. Stans and are being kept advised of the preliminary studies. This is not going to be a partisan effort. Many Democratic Members of Congress are just as disturbed as we are, and so are millions of Americans.

Our plan was widely ridiculed, the President proclaimed his budget "hard" and uncuttable, and the administration launched a counterattack filling 33 pages of the Congressional Record with lists of projects, programs, and Federal operations and Government offices that would have to shut down if we Republicans pursued our objective.

(Note: These lists were produced by the White House and distributed to the press by the Democratic National Committee.)

In addition, our task force members were challenged repeatedly to make public their "worksheets" showing exactly where we proposed to cut. The challenges were steadfastly refused because we knew that every pressure that a hostile bureaucracy could exert would be brought on Members of Congress to force them to vote against reductions. The bureaucrats, even without access to our worksheets, lived up to form.

Throughout the long months of labor on the appropriations bills, the pressures exerted on the Congress by officials of the executive branch to restore cuts were, as expected, enormous. The Post Office Department threatened to curtail mail deliveries. Defense and other Departments kept up a steady drumfire of protests. Even contractors to the Government were enlisted to bring pressure on Congress. Only the taxpaying public, which polls showed as believing a reduction in spending should accompany a tax cut, seemed to approved.

To their everlasting credit, our Republican members worked tirelessly, without flinching and without limelight or fanfare, to cut spending and waste.

To their everlasting credit, a substantial number of Democrats in both House and Senate joined in the effort which, because of the heavy Democratic majorities in both branches, could not be successful without them. It was truly a bipartisan effort but we take satisfaction in having initiated it and having overwhelmingly supported it.

Here are the amazing results which were achieved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriation bill</th>
<th>Budget request</th>
<th>Finally approved by Congress</th>
<th>Net reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interior</td>
<td>$996,000,000</td>
<td>$952,456,300</td>
<td>$-43,543,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury, Post Office</td>
<td>$6,196,842,000</td>
<td>$6,043,468,000</td>
<td>$-153,374,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, HHS</td>
<td>$2,750,000,000</td>
<td>$2,571,000,000</td>
<td>$-179,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>$6,368,755,000</td>
<td>$6,224,370,000</td>
<td>$-144,385,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td>$132,000,000</td>
<td>$130,000,000</td>
<td>$-2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State, Justice, etc.</td>
<td>$3,000,000,000</td>
<td>$2,829,000,000</td>
<td>$-171,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense</td>
<td>$14,000,000</td>
<td>$9,800,000</td>
<td>$-4,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td>$-400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent offices</td>
<td>$14,000,000,000</td>
<td>$13,224,518,000</td>
<td>$-775,482,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military construction</td>
<td>$1,850,000,000</td>
<td>$1,550,000,000</td>
<td>$-300,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public works</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$2,800,000</td>
<td>$-200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign aid:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I</td>
<td>$4,025,325,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000,000</td>
<td>$-1,025,325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titles II, III, IV, V</td>
<td>$349,670,339</td>
<td>$298,305,627</td>
<td>$-51,364,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$90,743,655,699</td>
<td>$90,457,220,641</td>
<td>$-6,286,435,058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beyond any doubt this congressional reduction of $6,286,135,039 in appropriations is the major achievement of the legislative branch during this long year, in fact, in any recent year. If the Johnson administration's budget for next year contains the economies promised by our new President, this historic action by the Congress can set the stage for a tax cut in 1964.

This $6,286,135,039 reduction in appropriations is the second largest cut in history and far exceeds any previous effort except for the action of a Republican President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and the Republican 88th Congress in cutting President Truman's budget requests for 1953-54 by $14 billion.

We, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, believe the Republicans in the Congress have again set an example and a pattern for the future in promoting sound fiscal policy. If any hardships have resulted, they are not in evidence. On the other hand, it now appears, assuming an economy budget next year, that Congress, in good faith, can enact a tax reduction in 1964, and the American people, in good conscience, can accept it.

Because of its success this year, we hope to continue our Republican task force operation in 1964. It has proven it can help eliminate waste, fat, and extravagance in even a hard budget.

(See Leadership statement, February 8, p. 51, and February 28, p. 38.)

**Tax Cut**

_August 14, 1963_

By Representative Halleck

A good example of what is wrong with President's Kennedy's legislative program is the tax bill.

Isolated from the rest of the Kennedy program the proposal for a $10 billion reduction in personal and corporate taxes makes sense. In the long run it would stimulate the economy by encouraging business expansion, new plant investment, and increased consumer spending, all of which would help create more jobs for the unemployed.

But when the proposal for a tax reduction is laid alongside the rest of the program on which Mr. Kennedy still insists, the whole package resembles a dangerous overdose of economic sleeping pills. While cutting taxes $10 billion, President Kennedy has made no retreat from his original program calling for:

- An increase of $4.5 billion in Federal expenditures;
- A total budget of $100 billion, the greatest sum any Government in the history of the world ever spent in a single year even during war;
- A planned deficit of $12 billion to be passed on to future generations.

Gallup polls, congressional mail, and every other kind of public opinion sampling show that the American people, in their good commonsense, think that taxes should not be cut without a cut in spending by the Federal Government. And that is what Congress thinks too—all Republican members certainly and a sizable number of Democrats can be included.

That is why the tax bill has for so long been in the House Ways and Means Committee; that is why many members doubt a tax cut will be passed this year.
What can Mr. Kennedy do about it? Call Congress outmoded? We doubt that he will do so. If he does, he will indict his own Democrat Congress and Democrat leaders.

All the President need do is send to Congress a significant schedule for voluntary reductions in his original spending requests and Congress will pass a tax reduction bill this year. It is that simple.

September 18, 1963

By Representative Halleck

The White House has announced that President Kennedy will address the Nation tonight on his proposal to cut taxes on borrowed money while increasing spending by the Federal Government. Obviously the President feels his personal appeal is necessary because of the established opposition of the American people to cutting taxes without cutting spending proposals.

We think it is important for the American people to realize that top leaders in Mr. Kennedy's own political party have the most serious doubts about the fiscal course he proposes. Within the past week Representative Wilbur Mills, chairman of the tax-writing House Committee on Ways and Means, and Representative Clarence Cannon, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, have publicly made statements critical of the President's determination to increase Federal spending at a time when he is asking for a tax cut.

Mr. Mills, arguing that a tax cut is a better road to economic stimulation than increased spending, put it in a nutshell in behalf of the Congress when he said:

We want it understood that we don't intend to go along both roads at the same time.

Mr. Cannon was even more specific when he said in a speech to the House:

** * ** We should take advantage of every opportunity to make every reduction (in appropriations), in every place possible. There is ample time in which to do it. ** * * ** There is no legitimate excuse not to do it ** * * ** The President will have to submit lower budgets. The machinery is at hand. All we need is the will.

Both of these committee chairmen are members of Mr. Kennedy's own political party and there are scores of other responsible Democrats in Congress who have the same doubts about Mr. Kennedy's spending.

Congress so far has passed only two major appropriations bills totaling $7 billion. Ten more appropriations bills representing an original $83 billion in budget requests await complete congressional action. We agree with Representative Cannon that "there is ample time" in which to do the necessary cutting in spending to put a tax reduction on a fiscally honest basis.

Frankly, we find Mr. Kennedy's economic theories mystifying, particularly in view of his own curious legislative record when he was a Member of Congress. In the Republican 80th Congress, when
we initiated a $5 billion tax cut after putting President Truman's budget in balance by cutting his spending, Mr. Kennedy, then a Member of the House, cast five votes on the legislation and he voted against a tax cut every single time.

Again, in the Republican 83d Congress, when we initiated a $7.1 billion tax cut, after chopping $10 billion out of the budget inherited by the Eisenhower administration from President Truman, Mr. Kennedy opposed the tax cut, announcing that although he was paired, "If I were at liberty to vote, I would note 'nay'.”

In considering President Kennedy's plea to the Nation, we think the American people should ask themselves how their President justifies his opposition on six occasions to tax cuts when spending had been drastically reduced, but now favors a tax cut when spending has been skyrocketing.

_September 18, 1963_

By Senator Dirksen

When President Kennedy broadcasts his appeal to the Nation tonight for support for a tax cut, we hope he will lay all the cards on the table, including these:

1. While Mr. Kennedy is proposing the Federal Government give the American people an $11 billion tax break with one hand, he is also advocating immediately borrowing the money back from them with the other hand, to meet the increased cost of his skyrocketing programs which he refuses to cut.

2. As a result, Mr. Kennedy is further proposing that the national debt be increased by an amount approximating the size of the tax cut, or to put it another way, we will be borrowing nearly $11 billion from our children so we can make it easier on ourselves while Mr. Kennedy goes right on increasing spending. In short, Mr. Kennedy proposes to let the next generation hold the bag.

Is it any wonder that every sample of public opinion for a year now, including both the Gallup and Harris polls, shows the American people do not favor a tax cut based on this kind of fiscal juggling? Obviously the President now knows this and that is why he is going to attempt to persuade the American public otherwise in his broadcast tonight.

There is a simple solution to Mr. Kennedy's dilemma and we Republicans have suggested it repeatedly. Call a halt to runaway spending. Hold the line.

We Republicans favor a tax reduction. We have been the sponsors of the only two major tax reductions in modern times. We will vote for this proposed tax cut if Mr. Kennedy will join the Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike, in seeking a substantial reduction in planned outlays for existing Federal programs and those authorized but not yet started. Leading members of his own party in Congress favor it.

If Mr. Kennedy wants public support for a tax cut, if Mr. Kennedy wants congressional support for a tax cut, then the President should actively help to cut spending now and he will get a tax reduction bill this year by a landslide vote.
The following was released with Senator Dirksen's and Representative Halleck's September 18, 1963, statements:

**Voting Record of President Kennedy on Tax Reduction Bills**

**80th Congress**

H.R. 1: An estimated $4 billion tax cut with relief from heavy wartime burdens to all income taxpayers with the largest percentage reduction to be enjoyed by those with incomes of $1,000 or less.

- Passed House on March 27, 1947. Yeas, 273; nays, 137; not voting, 22; Mr. Kennedy, not voting.
- Passed Senate on May 28, 1947.
- Vetoed by Truman on June 16, 1947.
- Failed of passage over veto in House on June 17, 1947. Yeas, 268; nays, 137; not voting, 24; Mr. Kennedy, nay.

H.R. 3950: Same as H.R. 1, only to go into effect 6 months later.

- Passed House July 8, 1947. Yeas, 302; nays, 112; not voting, 16; Mr. Kennedy, nay.
- Passed Senate July 14, 1947.
- Vetoed by Truman July 18, 1947.
- Passed House over veto July 18, 1947. Yeas, 299; nays, 108; not voting, 23; Mr. Kennedy, nay.
- Failed of passage over veto in Senate July 18, 1947.

H.R. 4790: An estimated $5 billion tax cut with 71 percent of the tax relief going to those with incomes under $5,000; 7.4 million wage earners in the lowest brackets removed from the tax roll; married couples allowed to divide their income for tax purposes and special relief for persons over 65 and the blind.

- Passed House February 2, 1948. Yeas, 297; nays, 120; not voting, 12; Present, 1; Mr. Kennedy, nay.
- Passed Senate, amended, March 22, 1948.
- Vetoed by Truman April 2, 1948.
- Passed House over veto April 2, 1948. Yeas, 311; nays, 88; not voting, 32; Mr. Kennedy, nay.
- Passed Senate over veto April 2, 1948 (Public Law 471).

**83rd Congress**

H.R. 8300: Congress by a series of steps allowed the wartime excess profits tax to expire; reduced excise tax rates approximately 50 percent; permitted personal income tax rates to drop 10 percent; and passed H.R. 8300 granting an additional $1.5 billion reduction for a total overall reduction of $7.1 billion, the greatest tax reduction in American history.

- Passed House March 18, 1954.
- Passed Senate, amended, July 2, 1954. Yeas, 63; nays, 9; not voting, 23; Mr. Kennedy, not voting.
- Approved by Eisenhower August 16, 1954 (Public Law 591).

---

1 From the Congressional Record of July 2, 1954: When his name was called, Mr. Kennedy said: "On this vote, I have a pair with the senior Senator from Alabama (Mr. Hill). If the senior Senator from Alabama were present and voting, he would vote 'Yea.' If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote 'Nay.' I withhold my vote."
UNEMPLOYMENT


February 8, 1963

By the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership.

In 1961 and again in 1962, President Kennedy sent Congress economic programs designed to solve unemployment, but there has been no marked improvement in the unemployment problem since Mr. Kennedy took office.

Senate Democratic Whip Hubert Humphrey was so enthusiastic on January 5, 1962, that he flatly predicted “the problem of unemployment in the United States will be a page in the history book rather than a living fact” by the end of the year. Unemployment stood at 4,663,000 when Senator Humphrey made his glowing prediction a year ago and it was 4,672,000 last month, or 9,000 higher when it was supposed only to be a page in the history book.

Now President Kennedy has sent to the Congress a third economic program to solve unemployment. What he describes as the “core” of his solution is a $10 billion tax cut, a $4.5 billion increase in Federal spending, and a $12 billion deficit.

This proposal is undoubtedly the biggest economic gamble in the history of nations.

It is advocated by an administration which so far has shown no expertise in meeting the unemployment problem.

It embraces no tried economic formula, in fact it runs counter to economic experience in the expansion of the job market.

Its principal novelty is the creation of a giant deficit by a tax cut, but deficits themselves are no novelty to the Democratic administrations of the last 30 years. Deficits have been their hallmark.

From 1933 through 1941, this Nation had 9 New Deal years of deficit spending aimed at solving the unemployment problem and it didn’t even make a dent in it. Only last year on November 13, 1962, six close associates of the New Deal were interviewed on NBC television. After being asked about the accomplishments of the New Deal, each was asked separately what he regarded as its “greatest single failure.” Three of them agreed as follows:

Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Commerce and Vice President under Roosevelt:

The greatest single lack in the New Deal was its failure to end the unemployment situation, which throughout the New Deal, until the shadow of war came over the horizon, brought about an unemployment of 7 or 8 million, or more than 15 percent.

Adolph A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State under Roosevelt:

The greatest single failure in the New Deal was to meet fundamentally the problem of recurrent unemployment.

James A. Farley, Post Master General under Roosevelt:

The failure in my judgment was to completely solve an almost impossible unemployment situation.
Apparently the Kennedy administration finds no lesson in history. In fact, in his economic message to Congress 2 weeks ago, Mr. Kennedy said that:

Until we restore full prosperity and the budget-balancing revenues it generates, our practical choice is not between deficit and surplus but between two kinds of deficits: between deficits born of waste and weakness and deficits incurred as we build future strength.

It is obvious from this statement that it has not occurred to the President that full prosperity could be the product of sound fiscal practices, of tax reduction accompanied by a reduction in Federal spending, of policies that create confidence in Government instead of doubt and uncertainty.

We, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, cannot accept a philosophy of government which says that the only choice is between two kinds of deficits. It is like a choice between two kinds of bankruptcy. You are broke in either case.

We say the Kennedy administration is engaging in a desperate kind of economics, because it has no solution to the unemployment problem.

The Republican goal in this Congress will be a reduction in Federal spending which can lead to a reasonable tax cut. It can be done because we have done it. The only two major tax cuts in the last 30 years were enacted by Republican Congresses and both times we cut spending substantially.

We suggest to the President that full employment is much more likely by this historically sound method, than by deficit financing which has never achieved full employment yet. Despite the fact we are outnumbered 2 to 1 in the Senate and 3 to 2 in the House, we shall strive for this sound objective in the conviction that the unemployed are only being duped by the administration’s proposals.

The Government can help solve unemployment by encouraging industry and investment capital to promote expansion and new ventures. It can help by convincing workers, consumers, and small business that inflation is not ahead. Chronic Government deficits will never stimulate American ingenuity, build confidence, or create jobs.

(See Leadership statement, December 20, 1963, p. 45.)

May 1, 1963

By Senator Dirksen

It has been months since President Kennedy sent his tax program to Congress, declaring a tax reduction to be the “core” of his solution to the current unemployment problem. In that time it has become abundantly clear that the President’s program is certainly far from being a solution to unemployment.

Mr. Kennedy contends that his program will help make jobs in two ways: (1) A $10 billion tax cut will stimulate consumer spending, thus increasing production and job prospects, and (2) a reduction in corporate taxes will encourage corporations to invest in new plant and equipment, thus creating more jobs. At first glance this sounds sensible, and certainly Republicans favor a sensible tax cut. But a second glance shows some basic flaws in Mr. Kennedy’s program.

In the first place the President is proposing that the $10 billion tax cut be accompanied by a $12 billion Federal deficit. This means there
is a strong possibility that instead of purchasing power being increased by the amount of the tax cut, it might be decreased by the amount of Government bonds sold to the public to pay for Mr. Kennedy's $12 billion deficit.

In the second place the President's proposal to stimulate employment by cutting corporate taxes has gimmicks in it that might mean as much of 5 years' delay in any beneficial effects. Many corporations will actually pay more taxes next year under the President's program than they are paying now because of his proposal that corporations accelerate their tax payments so that they will be on a pay-as-you-go basis by 1969.

The Congress now understands that Mr. Kennedy's tax program will not produce the results he claims it will. We think it is important that the public understand this, particularly the unemployed whose hopes will have been falsely kindled. The fact is that the Kennedy administration has been in office 27 months and it has not delivered on its promise to cure the unemployment problem. To picture the Kennedy kind of tax reduction as a new solution is completely without justification.

May 1, 1963

By Representative Halleck:

When the record of the Kennedy administration on unemployment is examined it is grim. Despite repeated campaign pledges to solve unemployment, virtually no advance has been made.

The sad truth is that government hiring (Federal, State, and local, and draft boards) have been almost the sole instrument for any relief in unemployment that has occurred.

Here are the figures:

Unemployment in January 1961 was 5,385,000; in January 1963 it was 4,672,000, or a net reduction of 713,000 in the 2 years.

The Kennedy administration has increased the Federal payroll by 125,141 jobholders, and 192,000 more persons have been called into the Armed Forces.

Since January 1961, according to the Department of Labor, State and local governments have increased their payrolls by 690,000 people.

This means there have been 1,007,141 people added to Government tax-financed payrolls at all levels since Mr. Kennedy took office. From these figures it would appear that there are 300,000 more people out of work under private employment than there were when Mr. Kennedy took office. This is another Kennedy deficit.

Nothing better illustrates the Kennedy administration's complete failure to solve the unemployment problem than these official figures. What a way to "get America moving again"!

It is interesting to note the number of persons entering the labor force during this 2-year period was only 768,000. This only emphasizes the magnitude of the Kennedy administration failure.

It should be clear to every thinking American and every employed and unemployed person that the New Frontier doesn't have the answers because it doesn't understand how the American system works. One Federal deficit after another hasn't created a job yet, but basically that is all President Kennedy has to offer the American people.

Representative Peter Frelinghuysen was a guest at a Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership press conference and made the following statement.
May 1, 1963

By Representative Frelinghuysen

By 1964 there will be an estimated 1 million jobless American young people in the 16-to-21-year-old category out of school and looking for work. Many of them will be jobless because they do not have the vocational skills or training to fit them for jobs in this era of technological change.

These young people are a crucial part of America's unemployment problem. Their lack of proper skills and proper training results in the paradox of jobs going begging while our youth search for jobs.

The Kennedy administration talks about youth unemployment but doesn't understand it. For example, it proposes legislation to establish a Youth Conservation Corps which will not come to grips with or in any way really alleviate the problem of jobless youth.

Republicans wrote the Manpower Retraining Act to help retrain our older unemployed and we think we have a better program than the Kennedy administration to tackle the problem of unemployed youth.

We advocate rejuvenation and redirection of vocational education in our public schools. We propose amending the Manpower Retraining Act to expand the youth training sections. We believe there should be a review of the statutes bearing on military service obligations in order to facilitate the smooth transition of our young men from school to civilian employment.

Republicans also believe a full-scale correction of laws and regulations which restrict youth opportunities should be initiated immediately.

We have been fighting and intend to keep fighting for programs that are based not on politics or expediency or keyed to the depression of the 1930's but on solutions geared to the needs of the 1960's.