

**The original documents are located in Box D4, folder “Ford Press Releases, January - May 1965” of the Ford Congressional Papers: Press Secretary and Speech File at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.**

### **Copyright Notice**

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. The Council donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

January 4, 1965

For immediate release

Statement of Rep. Gerald R. Ford

on

"State of the Union Message"

The ultimate goals set forth in the President's message are the goals of all Americans and have been the goals of America since its beginning.

However there are honest questions on the implementation of the programs to achieve these goals. I am confident the President does not want our citizens or the Congress to accept blindly the programs until there has been an opportunity to carefully examine them in detail.

In fact Mr. Johnson properly pointed out that there is room for an honest difference of opinion on "what is right."

We expect to support him when we believe he is right and to offer constructive alternatives when our conscience so demands.

January 4, 1965

For immediate release

Statement of Rep. Gerald R. Ford

on

"State of the Union Message"

The ultimate goals set forth in the President's message are the goals of all Americans and have been the goals of America since its beginning.

However there are honest questions on the implementation of the programs to achieve these goals. I am confident the President does not want our citizens or the Congress to accept blindly the programs until there has been an opportunity to carefully examine them in detail.

In fact Mr. Johnson properly pointed out that there is room for an honest difference of opinion on "what is right."

We expect to support him when we believe he is right and to offer constructive alternatives when our conscience so demands.

*Richard Nixon*  
Jan. 12, 1965

The Republican Party includes all those who believe in its principles and we welcome those who want to work for their implementation.

It will be strengthened by the inclusion of all those who believe in the party of Lincoln, Teddy Roosevelt and Dwight D. Eisenhower.



June 12

The Republican Party includes all those who believe in its principles  
and want to work for their implementation.

It will be strengthened by the inclusion of all those who support  
its platform.



The Republican Party includes all those who believe in its principles  
and we welcome those who want to work for their implementation.

It will be strengthened by the inclusion of all those who believe in  
the party of Lincoln, Teddy Roosevelt and Dwight D. Eisenhower.



*Open Release*

STATEMENT BY REP. GERALD R. FORD,  
HOUSE MINORITY LEADER

January 12, 1965

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Dean Burch assumed the responsibilities of the chairmanship at a crucial point. He worked faithfully and hard at the task.

The reasons which he gave for today's decision seem to be sound and in a worthy spirit.

I trust that all Republicans will now support our new chairman and move together vigorously and effectively toward those common goals which we all cherish.



STATEMENT BY REP. GERALD R. FORD,  
HOUSE MINORITY LEADER

January 12, 1965

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Dean Burch assumed the responsibilities of the chairmanship at a crucial point. He worked faithfully and hard at the task.

The reasons which he gave for today's decision seem to be sound and in a worthy spirit.

I trust that all Republicans will now support our new chairman and move together vigorously and effectively toward those common goals which we all cherish.



~~First Reactions to the 1966 Budget~~

*Trust Release*  
*1-25-65*

~~I only know what I heard from a reading of the message so I can't be too responsive until more opportunity is available to study this budget.~~

Clearly, there is much in the budget that will require long and careful study.

*The Congress will exercise its responsibility to determine that tax dollars are prudently & effectively spent.*

I just hope the Congress will squarely meet its responsibilities and stand on its own feet and decide what it thinks is best. Let us hope the rubber stamps of the 1930's are not resurrected.

In the interest of a clear understanding, we ought to dispel the myth about this budget being below \$100 billion. The more accurate gauge is the budget the President wants Congress to adopt this session--the new obligational authority budget. That total is \$106.4 billion, not \$99.7 billion. And on top of that, the President asks for \$6.0 in fiscal 1965 supplementals. So this budget is much more than \$100 billion.

I expect the President's request for about 45,000 more employees in civilian agencies will surprise a lot of people, especially since the impression is rather prevalent that the President was really hammering at the agencies to cut down on civilian employment. I commend his efforts but I do wonder about this rather large upturn, especially since this would mean the addition of about 154,000 employees since President Eisenhower left office.

When we adopted the tax cut bill last year the Democratic majority inserted a pledge to give priority to balancing the budget and then to reducing the debt. Today's budget doesn't seem to me to line up to that promise--spending increases and tax cuts get most of the increased revenues. The debt goes up another \$5.6 billion.



The President indicates this budget takes us along the path to a balanced budget. Its slow progress and a long path at the rate suggested in today's budget.

Since President Eisenhower left office the government, in the fiscal years 1962 through this budget for 1966, has, or will have gone \$32.4 billion deeper in debt. A lot of people may well wonder whether this is prudent and economical fiscal policy in times of affluence.

I think it best that all Members of Congress take a constructively skeptical look at the major features and issues in this budget and then do what he thinks best for America.



Statement of Rep. Gerald R. Ford

January 25, 1965

For immediate release

THE PRESIDENT'S 1966 BUDGET

Clearly, there is much in the budget that will require long and careful study. The Congress will exercise its responsibilities to determine that tax dollars are prudently and effectively spent.

In the interest of a clear understanding, we ought to dispel the myth about this budget being below \$100 billion. The more accurate gauge is the budget the President wants Congress to adopt this session--the new obligational authority budget. That total is \$106.4 billion, not \$99.7 billion. And on top of that, the President asks for \$6.0 in fiscal 1965 supplementals. So this budget is much more than \$100 billion.

I expect the President's request for about 45,000 more employees in civilian agencies will surprise a lot of people, especially since the impression is rather prevalent that the President was really hammering at the agencies to cut down on civilian employment.

When we adopted the tax cut bill last year the Democratic majority inserted a pledge to give priority to balancing the budget and then to reducing the debt. Today's budget doesn't seem to me to line up to that promise--spending increases and tax cuts get most of the increased revenues. The debt goes up another \$5.6 billion.

The President indicates this budget takes us along the path to a balanced budget. Its slow progress and a long path at the rate suggested in today's budget.

Since President Eisenhower left office the government, in the fiscal years 1962 through this budget for 1966, has or will have gone \$32.4 billion deeper in debt. A lot of people may well wonder whether this is prudent and economical fiscal policy in times of affluence.

I think it best that all Members of Congress take a constructively skeptical look at the major features and issues in this budget and then do what they think best for America.

#####

From the Office of:  
Rep. William Brock (R.-Tenn.)  
1441 House Office Building  
Washington 25, D. C.

Friday, February 19, 1965  
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Rep. William Brock (R. of Tenn.) today blasted "trap door spending" by the Administration which obligated the U.S. to \$750 million through the promises of Administration officials on a visit to Panama last year.

"Brock told the House: "In past years, we have heard much about back-door spending through the Treasury, without any Congressional check through the appropriations process. Because a vast majority on both sides of the aisle here in the House saw back-door spending as a means of circumventing Congress' Constitutional prerogatives, we did something about it.

"The bill before us today, the Inter-American Development Bank bill, goes far further than mere back-door spending. At least back-door spending is done by Americans. What we have before us today is what I prefer to call "trap-door" spending. Last April, at a meeting in Panama, U.S. officials decided that Congress would authorize and appropriate an additional \$750 million to the IDB's Fund for Special Operations.

"At a meeting dominated by Latin American officials, it was decided how much, for what purpose, and under what banking regulations the United States Congress would authorize and appropriate \$750 million.

"The trap in this trap-door financing is that advocates of the bill will tell you that Congress must support this legislation, or stand accused of renegeing on an international agreement entered into by our Secretary of Treasury nearly a year ago.

"Two years from now -- without the knowledge of a single member of the House or Senate -- Treasury officials may commit Congress to spending an additional billion or billion and a half dollars for IDB, prior to a single day's hearings before the appropriate Congressional committee."

: # # # #

**Congress of the United States**  
**Office of the Minority Leader**  
**House of Representatives**  
**Washington, D.C.**

March 1, 1965

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

The forceful, articulate and encompassing speech titled "Republican Opportunity and Responsibility" made today by my able colleague and good friend Mel Laird was a very proper statement by him as the 1964 Chairman of the Republican Platform Committee.

A copy was given to me several days ago and I have read it.

Mr. Laird did not seek approval or disapproval by me or the House Republican leadership as a whole.

The speech will be very helpful in presenting the Republican case against the Administration, and the new positive Republican approach to our Nation's problems.

# # #



Statement by REP. GERALD R. FORD

March 1, 1965

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

The forceful, articulate and encompassing speech titled "Republican Opportunity and Responsibility" made today by my able colleague and good friend Mal Laird was a very proper statement by him as the 1964 Chairman of the Republican Platform Committee.

A copy was given to me several days ago and I have read it.

Mr. Laird did not seek approval or disapproval by me or the House Republican leadership.

The speech will be very helpful in presenting the Republican case against the Administration and the new positive Republican approach to our Nation's problems.

# # #



Statement by REP. GERALD R. FORD  
March 1, 1965

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

The forceful, articulate and encompassing speech titled "Republican Opportunity and Responsibility" made today by my able colleague and good friend Mel Laird was a very proper statement by him as the 1964 Chairman of the Republican Platform Committee.

A copy was given to me several days <sup>ago</sup> and I have read it.

Mr. Laird did not seek approval or disapproval by me or the House Republican leadership.

The speech will be very helpful in presenting the Republican case against the Administration and the new positive Republican approach to our Nation's problems.

# # #



From the office of Rep. Gerald R. Ford

Statement on the President's Message on Cities

March 2, 1965

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

The goals in the President's message on cities are both lofty and humanitarian. He has painted a verbal dramatic picture of community problems that do exist in many parts of the Nation.

However, the message to Congress emphasizes the Administration's strong desire to create far more federal centralization of power, which is already in too many instances throttling metropolitan initiative and local responsibility.

The federal government has no business telling cities how to think and plan, as the President would have a new Department of Housing and Urban Development do under his recommendations.

In the message there are many dangerous indications that the President is urging the establishment of more encompassing bureaucratic control of cities.

The Republican housing proposal, which was outlined several weeks ago, will help cities to help themselves without putting the lives of citizens in the hands of federal planners. In addition, the Republicans suggested a new program for veterans under FHA which would include sound benefits to those who served in war and peacetime.

While the President would create another federal agency, the Republican legislative proposal calls for combining the Urban Renewal Administration and the Public Housing Administration to eliminate duplication.

The Republican proposal, which is a constructive alternative to the Administration bill, calls for a humanized housing program that would have a positive impact on the problems of urban America without clutching cities in the grip of federal centralized power.

#####



**Congress of the United States**  
**Office of the Minority Leader**  
**House of Representatives**  
**Washington, D.C.**

Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford  
regarding House vote on Appalachia Bill

March 3, 1965

In passing the Administration's Appalachia Bill today, Democrats in the House played politics with poverty and ignored distressed areas in many parts of the Nation.

The Republican alternative pinpointed areas in need of federal assistance where the problems cannot be solved by local resources alone.

The Nation should be aware that the Administration's Appalachia Bill gives aid to nearly one-fourth of 360 counties that are rich enough to be disqualified for federal aid under either the Accelerated Public Works program or the Area Redevelopment project.

Democrats in voting for the Administration's bill today agreed to take money from their own counties, many in need of assistance, and give it to a relatively small pocket in the Appalachia region.

The Republican proposal would have provided a helping hand to 1,407 areas in the United States which are suffering economic distress.

-more

**Congress of the United States**  
**Office of the Minority Leader**  
**House of Representatives**  
**Washington, D.C.**

Statement on Appalachia Bill  
March 3, 1965

-2-

Today's action emphasizes the need for a strong two-party system  
that would insure strong checks and balances and would protect the  
American people against super-government with too much heavy-handed,  
iron-fist control in Washington.

# # # #

**Congress of the United States**  
**Office of the Minority Leader**  
**House of Representatives**  
**Washington, D.C.**

Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford  
regarding the President's Message  
on Law Enforcement

For immediate release

March 8, 1965

No one will disagree that the Nation's crime rate is on the increase and the "trend toward lawlessness," as the President describes it, must be reversed.

The President may be duplicating unnecessarily the fine work of the FBI when he appoints a new Commission to study the "origins and nature of crime in modern America."

There are strong indications that the Message has many earmarks of seeking to create more centralized government and more federal control over states and cities.

Basically, law enforcement is a local problem, except in those areas where the federal government has a specific responsibility.

The government can and should give leadership in meeting the menace of lawlessness, but should not encroach on those responsibilities that are rightfully in the hands of responsible local officials.

# # #

A statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford (R-Mich)

regarding the President's Message on Voting Rights

March 15, 1965

FOR RELEASE AFTER DELIVERY OF THE PRESIDENT'S  
MESSAGE, March 15, 1965

I strongly believe effective federal voting legislation is needed so that all qualified citizens wherever they live can vote by 1966. Republicans in the House under the leadership of Rep. William McCulloch have been and are working on such legislation with its many complex issues and different approaches. Republicans in the House will support legislation to achieve maximum registration and voting by the target date of 1966. I am pleased that we now have the President's recommendations in this critical area.

From what I have seen and heard the President's proposal is deficient in that it may penalize certain states where there is no discrimination and it may fail to resolve the problem in some areas where eligible voters are not permitted to register.

I am also concerned with the establishment of a huge, new bureaucracy of voting examiners which could be perpetuated even though the problem of voter registration is resolved.

#####

[April 1965?]

OUTLINE OF REPUBLICAN VOTING RIGHTS BILL

1. Certification by the Attorney General

If the Attorney General certifies that, in any county or similar subdivision of a State, he has received complaints to the effect that 25 or more persons have been denied or deprived of the right to register or to vote on account of race or color, an examiner who is a resident of the State shall be appointed by the Civil Service Commission.

2. Duties of the Examiner

(a) The examiner shall determine whether, in fact, these 25 or more persons have been denied or deprived of the right to register or to vote and whether they are qualified to vote under State law.

(b) The examiner shall find that a person has been denied or deprived of the right to register or to vote, if, within 90 days preceding thereto, the person (i) has been unable to make an application with a local registrar within 2 days after making a good faith effort to do so, (ii) has been found not qualified to vote by a local registrar, or (iii) has not been notified of the results of his application within 7 days after making application therefor.

(c) The examiner shall apply voting qualifications established by State law to these 25 or more persons, except that he shall not apply (i) any literacy tests to persons possessing a sixth grade education, (ii) any requirement of "good moral character", or (iii) any requirement that qualifications must be proved by the voucher of registered voters or members of any other class.

(d) Those persons found qualified to vote by the examiner shall be placed on a list of eligible voters and shall be issued registration certificates.

(e) The list of eligible voters, together with a report evidencing their qualification, shall be sent to the State Attorney General and to the appropriate local election officials.

(f) Persons placed on the list of eligible voters shall have the right to vote without restriction in any subsequent election, unless challenged according to the provisions detailed in paragraph 3. If challenged, they shall have the right to vote provisionally, with their ballots being impounded until the challenge has been determined by the hearing officer and the court.

3. Challenges to Findings of the Examiner

(a) The State Attorney General and any appropriate election official within the county shall have 10 days from receipt of the examiner's list and report to challenge findings of the examiner.

(b) Challenges shall be made to a hearing officer appointed by the Civil Service Commission.

(c) The hearing officer shall pass upon the challenges within 7 days.

(d) An appeal from the determination of the hearing officer must be made within 15 days thereafter to the Court of Appeals of the Circuit within which the persons challenged so reside.

4. Establishment of a Pattern or Practice

(a) Upon determination of the hearing officer that 25 or more of those persons whom the Attorney General certified, are qualified to vote, such determination shall establish a pattern or practice of denial of the right to register or vote on account of race or color.

5. Appointment of Additional Examiners

(a) Upon the establishment of a pattern or practice, as described in section 4, the Civil Service Commission shall appoint additional examiners as may be necessary to determine whether persons within the county are qualified to vote.

(b) The examiners shall apply the same procedures and be subject to the same conditions as the initial examiner was, as described in section 2 (c) through (f), and a person shall not be required to first make application with a local registrar if he states, under oath, that to make such application would be futile or would subject him or his family to physical or economic intimidation or harm.

(c) As in section 2, those persons found qualified shall have the right to vote without restriction if not challenged. If challenged, they shall have the right to vote provisionally until the challenge is determined, with their ballots being impounded.

(d) Also, as in section 3, the State shall have 10 days to challenge the examiner's findings before a hearing officer and the hearing officer must make his determination within 7 days thereafter.

(e) Persons, found qualified to vote pursuant to this Act, shall be entitled to vote unless the examiner determines that (1) he has not voted or attempted to vote once during 4 consecutive years or during such longer period as allowed by state registration laws, or (2) he has otherwise lost his eligibility to vote.

6. Denial of the Right to Vote.

Whenever a person alleges to an examiner within 24 hours after an election that he has been denied the right to vote, although found qualified by an examiner,

the examiner shall notify the local U.S. Attorney. The U.S. Attorney is authorized to seek an order of contempt against the election officials in the U.S. district court. Also, any State or local official who denies such a person the right to vote, or to count such person's vote, or otherwise intimidates, threatens or coerces such person for the purpose of preventing such person from voting shall be fined up to \$5,000 and imprisoned up to five years.

7. Termination of a Pattern or Practice

(a) The provisions of this Act shall continue in force and effect until within a 12 month period less than 25 persons within the county have been placed on lists of eligible voters by examiners.

8. Qualification of Examiners

(a) Examiners shall be existing Federal officers or employees who are residents of the State in which the Attorney General has issued his certification.

[Apr. 1965?]

By Rep. Gerald R. Ford  
Minority Leader, House of Representatives

Often at banquets, the master of ceremonies goes to great lengths in introducing the speaker to the audience.

I recall one particular instance when the person in charge of the program traced by history from high school days, covering the ground with great thoroughness. His introduction was liberally sprinkled with flattering adjectives.

In his words, I was more than just a member of the University of Michigan football teams. To him, I was another Tom Harmon, which I wasn't.

He hit the highspots of my political career, obviously after a lot of research, and embellished some of the facts with what bordered on fiction.

Winding up his introduction, the man told the audience that I was one of the "great, great statesmen" in Congress.

I made my speech, probably falling short of the expectations built up by the introduction.

While walking to our car in a parking lot a couple of blocks away, my wife and I discussed the program and the events of the evening.

I asked her how many great, great statesmen she thought were in Congress.

Before answering, Betty walked in silence for a few moments. Then she stopped, turned and with a smile tapped me on the shoulder with her finger and said, "One less than you think."

# # #





The President is to be commended for his insistence on no retreat in Viet-Nam. But, there is a strong hint in his message dealing with Communist aggression in Southeast Asia and the fate of 15 million people of South Viet-Nam that he wants to buy peace. History proves that friendship, security and solid international relationships cannot be bought and sold with dollars in the geo-political market place when the Communists are involved.

The President's contention that the United States is ready for "unconditional discussions" sounds much like "negotiations," which must be carried on only from a position of strength. Until we prove to the Communists that we mean business, it would be sheer folly to attempt a negotiated settlement.

I hope that the President, who has been given staunch support by Republican leadership in the past when he ordered stepped-up military operations against aggressor supply lines, realizes that the United States will end up in second place if we retreat under pressure or a meaningless settlement.

We all hope that peace will return soon in troubled and war-torn Viet-Nam, but peace with justice and security cannot be purchased with a billion American tax dollars.

Whether the conflict spreads depends upon the power-hungry Communist aggressors. If we use our military strength wisely and effectively, and if we get growing support from our Southeast Asia allies, the war in Viet-Nam can end without the loss of freedom for our allies or a retreat by the United States to Pearl Harbor.

If we are right in principle, which we are, use the power we have and persevere, freedom and security will prevail.

#####

Excerpts from the remarks by Rep. Gerald R. Ford

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

April 8, 1965

Mr. Chairman,

I conclude with these observations. The House Republican Policy Committee and the House Republican Conference have endorsed H.R. 7057, the Byrnes bill, as the motion to recommit. H.R. 7057 was unanimously endorsed by all of the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means. I commend the Republicans on the Committee for their hard and constructive work. I especially commend Congressman John Byrnes for his leadership in drafting H.R. 7057 which is constructive legislation, far preferable to the Committee proposal.

As far as final passage is concerned, if the motion to recommit fails, neither the House Republican Policy Committee nor the House Republican Conference have recommended any guidelines. This is quite understandable. The Committee bill, H.R. 6675, is to a substantial degree Republican legislation, except that part which incorporates the Administration's King-Anderson proposal for hospital care financed by a payroll tax.

Many of my Republican colleagues, in weighing the Republican portions of H.R. 6675 against the Administration's part of the same bill, with understandable logic will vote for the bill on final passage. On the other hand some of us, including myself, have strongly and consistently opposed the regressive payroll tax method of financing hospital care for the aged.

In my judgment that portion of H.R. 6675 which is unsound, outweighs the good. In the final analysis it is one's own conscience, not a Republican policy position, that will determine how Republicans will vote on final passage.

I conclude, however, by re-emphasizing that the Republican motion to recommit is sound. It is our policy as a party. I urge that my colleagues support the Byrnes substitute, H.R. 7057.

Sharon Bartlett, 21, who will represent Michigan in the National Cherry Blossom Festival April 10-17 in Washington, D.C. receives a gift from Congressman Gerald R. Ford, House Republican Leader. A University of Michigan senior, Miss Bartlett was chosen by the Michigan State Society in Washington to compete for the title of ~~the~~ Cherry Blossom Princess. The book she received from Ford is a compilation of art displayed in the U.S. Capitol. She is the daughter of Iym Bartlett, former Superintendent of the Department of Public Instruction in Michigan.

# # #



From the Office of Rep. Gerald R. Ford  
H-230 The Capital

Chris [unclear] For Immediate Release  
April 13, 1965

~~SECRET~~

Rep. Gerald Ford (R-Mich.), House Republican Minority Leader, today warned a visiting group of Brazilian editors that " unless current trends are checked, we are heading for an outbreak of Viet Nam-type guerilla wars in Latin America. "

Ford said that " a vacillating hemispheric policy regarding the flow of subversive weapons and propaganda has set the stage for Communist guerilla aggression, under the guise of so-called 'National Liberation Fronts', throughout the Western Hemisphere.

" Cuba and Viet Nam have furnished the models for Communist guerilla aggression aimed at overthrowing existing pro-Western governments," Ford declared. " And as our experience in these two countries has proven so painfully, economic aid by itself is not sufficient to check a subversive Communist campaign, financed and supplied from outside. "

The House Minority Leader told the Brazilians, in Washington for the Fortaleza, Brazil Journalists Project, that current U.S. and hemispheric policy toward Castro Cuba " seems to be one of letting sleeping Communist wolves lie. "

" But we ought to know that the Communist wolf in Havana is very active, " Ford said. " If the Red plan to create Viet Nam-type wars in Latin America takes hold, Havana would serve as the Hanoi of the entire operation. It is today the capital of Communist subversion in the heartland of the Free World. "

Ford expressed hope that " Brazil will continue the progress it has made in recent months toward a return to stable and sound government. "

#####



From the Office of Rep. Gerald R. Ford  
H-230 The Capitol

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

April 13, 1965

Rep. Gerald Ford (R-Mich.), House Republican Minority Leader, today warned a visiting group of Brazilian editors that "unless current trends are checked, we are heading for an outbreak of Viet Nam-type guerilla wars in Latin America."

Ford said that " a vacillating hemispheric policy regarding the flow of subversive weapons and propaganda has set the stage for Communist guerilla aggression, under the guise of so-called 'National Liberation Fronts', throughout the Western Hemisphere.

" Cuba and Viet Nam have furnished the models for Communist guerilla aggression aimed at overthrowing existing pro-Western governments," Ford declared. " And as our experience in these two countries has proven so painfully, economic aid by itself is not sufficient to check a subversive Communist campaign, financed and supplied from outside. "

The House Minority Leader told the Brazilians, in Washington for the Fortaleza, Brazil Journalists Project, that current U.S. and hemispheric policy toward Castro Cuba " seems to be one of letting sleeping Communist wolves lie. "

" But we ought to know that the Communist wolf in Havana is very active," Ford said. " If the Red plan to create Viet Nam-type wars in Latin America takes hold, Havana would serve as the Hanoi of the entire operation. It is today the capital of Communist subversion in the heartland of the Free World."

Ford expressed hope that " Brazil will continue the progress it has made in recent months toward a return to stable and sound government."

BIOGRAPHICAL OUTLINE

Frank Mitchell, newly-appointed House Page

April 14, 1965

Frank Mitchell, 15, of 1421 Fifteenth St., Springfield, Ill. is the first Negro to serve as a Page in the House of Representatives.

His foster parents are Mr. and Mrs. Henry VanBuren of the same address.

Frank is an outstanding student in the Sophomore Class of Feitshans High School in Springfield, where he is room president of his class and a chess champion.

His father is a custodian at the Iles School in Springfield.

The appointee will have the personal guidance of Mrs. Eulalia O. Corbin while he is in Washington. Mrs. Corbin, of Springfield, is executive secretary to Rep. Robert McClory (R-Ill) of Lake Bluff, Ill.

# # #

A statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford  
on the appointment of a New House Page

April 14, 1965

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

This marks an historic moment in the history of the House of Representatives. The appointment of Frank Mitchell of Springfield, Illinois, as a Page in the House is a milestone of importance. He will be the first Negro to serve as a Page in the House.

It is a pleasure to join with Rep. Leslie Arends in endorsing this appointment, which was recommended by Rep. Paul Findley of the Illinois 20th District.

I congratulate Illinois State Rep. J. David Jones, Precinct Committeeman Victor Barboletti of Springfield, and the committee of Springfield educators and others who have played roles in sponsoring this fine young man.

With other members of the House, I welcome Frank Mitchell to The Capitol with a wish that he finds his experience here to be an interesting, educational and inspiring one.

# # #

From the office of  
Representative Paul Findley (R. Ill.)

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

April 14, 1965

Rep. Paul Findley (R.-Ill.), in commenting upon the appointment of Frank V. Mitchell, aged 15, Springfield, Illinois, as the first Negro page to serve in the U. S. House of Representatives, said:

"The appointment of Frank Mitchell, the first member of his race to serve as a page in the U. S. House of Representatives, is very appropriate at this time, for it comes on the eve of the 100th anniversary of the death of Abraham Lincoln.

"Frank shares the distinction of coming from the same home town as Mr. Lincoln, that of Springfield, Illinois, which I am proud to say is included in the Congressional District I represent. I am happy to have had the opportunity to sponsor Frank Mitchell for this significant appointment."

In response to the confirmation of his appointment, Frank Mitchell said:

"I appreciate this honor very much. I will do everything in my power to be a credit to the Congress, the Republican Party, my parents, and my community in return for the confidence they have shown in me by giving me this wonderful opportunity."





Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford  
requested by United Press International

April 15, 1965

The House of Representatives since January 4th has been the victim of political karate and Presidential arm-twisting.

Outnumbered 2 to 1---with a majority of Democrats echoing the President's wishes like political parrots---Republicans refused to rubber-stamp Administration-sponsored legislation.

Republicans presented constructive alternatives that offered more to the American people, yet were based on sound, fiscal principles.

There are strong indications that Republicans---united in the House---will win support throughout the country.

The record we establish will assure victories in 1966, when we predict the American electorate will discover that most of the voters cannot afford membership in the Great Society without fracturing their bank accounts and wallets and going deeper into debt.

# # #

310  
1600  
47



Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford  
for Republican Congressional Committee

one-minute tape April 15, 1965

10:30  
in office

The House of Representatives since January 4th has been the victim  
of political karate and Presidential arm-twisting ~~and~~

Outnumbered 2 to 1---with a majority of Democrats echoing the President's  
wishes like political parrots---- Republicans refused to rubber-stamp  
Administration-spawned legislation.

Republicans presented constructive alternatives that offered more  
to the American people, yet were based on sound, fiscal principles.

There are strong indications that Republicans---united in the House---  
will win support throughout the country.

The record we establish will assure victories in 1966, when we  
predict the American electorate will discover that most of the voters  
cannot afford membership in the Great Society---without fracturing their  
bank accounts and wallets and going deeper into debt.

# # #



Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford (R-Mich)  
on President's remarks at a News Conference April 27, 1965

The President's restatement that the United States intends to stay in Viet-Nam to help halt aggression by Communist attackers should be applauded.

I support the President's renewed pledge that we must stand firm in Viet-Nam to guarantee an eventual lasting peace. Congressional Republican leadership has supported the Administration's policy in that war-torn country while too many Democrats have openly attacked the President for his position.

It is gratifying to know that the President is critical of his critics, many of them in his own political empire.

The President has confirmed our earlier position that perhaps military action against aggressors in Viet-Nam was tardy. Unfortunately, our restraint was viewed as a weakness by the enemy. It is somewhat shameful that this strong country waited for more murders, more savage attacks against the peaceful citizenry of South Viet-Nam until we took an active part in beating down aggressors by attacking their supply lines and military installations.

Certainly, as the President said, we should seek to achieve a lasting peace in Viet-Nam, but not to the extent of buying it with a billion dollars in foreign aid under a program the Administration recommended earlier.

#####

From the office of Rep. Gerald R. Ford (R-Mich)  
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

FOR RELEASE APRIL 28, 1965

A scholarship for a summer educational program in American politics and government is offered to women college students of the Fifth District of Michigan by Mount Vernon Junior College in Washington, D. C., Rep. Gerald R. Ford (R-Mich) announced today.

Lecture and seminar courses offering up to six hours of credit in American government, domestic politics, foreign relations, history and culture are included in the scholarship, which covers tuition, room and board.

Women students, who have legal residence in the Fifth District and attend accredited two-year or four-year colleges in the United States, are eligible for the scholarship, Ford said.

The winner, to be chosen by Mount Vernon Junior College, will pay only transportation to and from Washington, laundry and personal expenses.

The six-week session from June 21 through July 30 will utilize the resources of the Nation's Capitol, combining academic study in small classes and field work to introduce students to the Congress, the Executive branch, the Courts, various governmental agencies, and major private organizations located in Washington.

Ford emphasized that interested students are to immediately write to Otis L. Graham, Administrative Assistant to the President, Mount Vernon Junior College, 2100 Foxhall Road, Washington, D. C. 20007.

The scholarship is being offered to the Fifth District as the result of Ford being appointed by the College to the Advisory Committee for the summer educational program.

Ford described the summer session as a program aimed at "achieving more understanding of the American political system among college students, creating a better-informed citizenry, and encouraging those interested in public service careers."

Located in the northwest section of Washington, Mount Vernon Junior College is on a 26-acre wooded campus. Recreational facilities include tennis courts, a swimming pool, gymnasium, and athletic field.

# # # #

Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford (R-Mich.)  
May 3, 1965

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Our Nation's fight against Communism in the Dominican Republic and Southeast Asia virtually demands that the President immediately come to Congress for a supplement to the military budget submitted to the House and Senate in January before the United States became involved in conflict in two hemispheres.

If we are to bolster our effort in fighting Communism in two hemispheres, it may require a revision of certain legislative programs, including a new look at the President's recommendations on overall fiscal policy and tax reduction.

I also urge that the United States recognize that the cause of the current strife and trouble in Latin America is Fidel Castro.

Latin America, in fact the Western Hemisphere, will not be free of Communism's dangerous threat until the arsonist Fidel Castro is eradicated. He is the "fire-starter" in the Dominican Republic.

At the same I suggest that President Johnson carry out the original four-point program which John F. Kennedy demanded in fighting Communism.

During the 1960 presidential campaign and at the time of the Cuban missile crisis, the late President insisted on: inspection of missile sites in Cuba, removal of all Soviet forces from Cuba, support of free Cuban forces both inside and outside of that country, and blocking the export of Communism in this hemisphere from Castro's bastion.

It makes no sense to fight Communism 6,000 miles away in Viet Nam or to protect American lives in the Dominican Republic against aggression unless we take care of the generator of turbulence almost within sight of our country.

# # # # #

Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford (R-Mich)  
May 3, 1965

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Our Nation's fight against Communism in the Dominican Republic and Southeast Asia virtually demands that the President immediately come to Congress for <sup>a supplement to</sup> an increase in the military budget <sup>submitted to the Congress in January before the U.S. became involved in conflict in two hemispheres.</sup>

If we are to bolster our effort in fighting Communism in two hemispheres, it may require a revision of certain Legislative programs, including a new look at the President's recommendations on overall fiscal policy and tax reductions.

I also urge that the United States <sup>concentrate</sup> ~~go~~ the cause of the current strife and trouble in Latin America, which is on the island of Cuba just 90 miles from our shore.

Latin America, in fact the Western Hemisphere, will not be free of Communism's dangerous threat until the arsonist Fidel Castro is eradicated. He is the "fire-starter" in the Dominican Republic.

At the same time I suggest that President Johnson <sup>cancel Castro's out</sup> ~~cancel~~ <sup>four</sup> ~~the~~ original <sup>four</sup> point program which John F. Kennedy demanded in fighting Communism <sup>in</sup>

<sup>During the 1960 presidential campaign & at the time of the Cuban missile crisis</sup>  
The late President insisted on: inspection of missile sites in Cuba, removal of all Soviet forces from <sup>Cuba</sup> that island, support of free Cuban forces both inside and outside of that country, and blocking the export of Communism <sup>from Castro's bastion.</sup>

It makes no sense to fight <sup>Communism</sup> ~~Communism~~ 6,000 miles away in Viet Nam or to protect American lives in the <sup>Dominican</sup> ~~Dominican~~ Republic against ~~Communist~~ aggression unless we take care of the ~~source~~ generator of ~~aggression~~ almost within sight of our country.  
turbulence ~~exists in our hemisphere~~

# # #



Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford (R-Mich)  
May 3, 1965

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Our Nation's fight against Communism in the Dominican Republic and Southeast Asia virtually demands that the President immediately comes to Congress for a supplement to the military budget submitted to the House and Senate in January before the United States became involved in conflict in two hemispheres.

If we are to bolster our effort in fighting Communism in two hemispheres, it may require a revision of certain legislative programs, including a new look at the President's recommendations on overall fiscal policy and tax reduction.

I also urge that the United States goes to the cause of the current strife and trouble in Latin America, which is on the island of Cuba just 90 miles from our shore.

Latin America, in fact the Western Hemisphere, will not be free of Communism's dangerous threat until the arsonist Fidel Castrol is eradicated. He is the "fire-starter" in the Dominican Republic.

At the same time I suggest that President Johnson carries out the original four-point program which John F. Kennedy demanded in fighting Communism.

During the 1960 presidential campaign and at the time of the Cuban missile crisis, the late President insisted on: inspection of missile sites in Cuba, removal of all Soviet forces from Cuba, support of free Cuban forces both inside and outside of that country, and blocking export of Communism in this hemisphere from Castro's bastion.

It makes no sense to fight Communism 6,000 miles away in Viet Name or to protect American lives in the Dominican Republic against aggression unless we take care of the generator of turbulence almost within sight of our country.

# # #



Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford  
for Olds Manor "Open House"--Grand Rapids, May 8, 1965

(TAPE TO BE ~~RECORDED~~ MADE BY APRIL 28)

Olds Manor, where you are gathered today, is a tribute to the Michigan Baptist Convention and others who have given of themselves and their resources to make the autumn years of life a time of new meaning and new friendships.

This is a place of inspiration where senior citizens are finding spiritual, mental and physical satisfaction to give added depth to their later years.

Olds Manor---one of the finest facilities of its type in Michigan---provides gracious living in the heart of a city long known for its warm, human qualities.

It is particularly significant that Olds Manor is located in the center of a massive, exciting redevelopment of the downtown area in Grand Rapids, which has a widely-known reputation as one of America's most friendly cities.

In the best tradition of a free Nation, this haven for senior citizens is established on the foundation of brotherhood and compassion.

Private enterprise and individual effort have made possible this splendid facility. It is refreshing in this era of growing federal government control of our lives to see this kind of local teamwork achieve an important goal.

This city is a much better place because of Olds Manor. Grand Rapids, I know, must take pride in being the site of this friendly haven where the years can be spent in dignity, in comfort, and in an atmosphere of neighborliness.





The ministry of the Michigan Baptist Convention and those supporting the growth and development of Olds Manor have met a challenging opportunity with wisdom and foresight.

To those who have joined the Olds Manor ~~family~~ family, I have a special personal wish----- I hope you have many years of happiness and pleasure, comfort and joy----- and, I am looking forward to visiting with you in the near future when I return to Michigan.

# # #



Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford  
May 10, 1965

It is particularly significant in this turbulent time of aggression against freedom in many parts of the world that we pay tribute to the spirit and courage of the Rumanian people.

This Tenth of May traditional national holiday celebration is a living symbol of perseverance in seeking freedom while facing tremendous obstacles.

The free world takes a monumental pause today to honor the history of Rumania where its people can no longer commemorate this date behind the Iron Curtain.

Although tragic circumstances silence the people in Rumania, we in the free world send them assurance that a time of independence must ultimately be achieved.

We join with Rumanians, who are captive in their homeland and must celebrate today in their hearts, in hoping for the dawn of a new time when freedom will return to their country.

\* \* \*



Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford  
May 10, 1965  
Commemorating National Holiday of the Rumanian People

It is particularly significant in this turbulent time of aggression against freedom in many parts of the world that we pay tribute to the spirit and courage of the Rumanian people.

This traditional national holiday celebration is a living symbol of perseverance in seeking freedom while facing tremendous obstacles.

The free world takes a monumental pause today to honor the history of Rumania where its people can no longer commemorate this date behind the Iron Curtain.

Although tragic circumstances silence the people in Rumania, we in the free world send them assurance that a time of independence must ultimately be achieved.

We join with Rumanians, who are captive in their homeland and must celebrate today in their hearts, in hoping for the dawn of a new time when freedom will return to their country.

# # #



Radio-tape statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford  
announcing appointment of Rep. John W. Wydler to Committee on Govt. Opns.

( 1-minute ) May 17, 1965

The appointment of Nassau's senior Congressman John W. Wydler to the highly important Committee on Government Operations is of major significance not only to the citizens of his district but to the entire Nation.

This committee is a prime factor in seeking more streamlined and more efficient government at all levels, including the present powerful Executive arm. John Wydler comes to the committee with a highly-regarded reputation for his work in seeking to eliminate duplication and waste in government.

It is extremely fortunate that a man of Congressman Wydler's ability is available for this most important position in Washington.

This is his second major committee assignment in Congress. John also serves as a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee, which has charge of our Nation's vital national space program.

# # #



Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

Room 417, Old House Office Building  
Washington, D. C.

May 13, 1965

*Memorandum*

Dear Mr. Meyer:

Attached is the release Mr. Wydler had planned to ask Mr. Ford to make concerning his election to the Government Operations Committee. He has instead made a personal release similar to the attached, as he felt it would be timely to make the announcement yesterday.

Mr. Wydler hopes Mr. Ford will make a one minute tape announcing the appointment. Mr. Wydler will have additional copies made and distribute them to the radio stations in his district. For this purpose, Mr. Wydler thought the first part of this release might be helpful.

Mr. Wydler would appreciate if this could be expedited. FROM: John W. Wydler

Bette Hoppel

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

FORD NAMES WYDLER TO COMMITTEE  
ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

House Minority Leader Jerry Ford (R-Michigan) today announced that Nassau's Senior Congressman John W. Wydler (R.-Garden City) has been appointed to the highly important Committee on Government Operations. This is Congressman Wydler's second major committee assignment. He also serves on the Science and Astronautics Committee, which has charge of our national space program.

"The Committee on Government Operations is responsible for a wide range of Federal government activities and it is extremely fortunate that a man of Congressman Wydler's ability is available for this position", the Minority Leader said. "Congressman Wydler is one of the most active supporters of establishing a new 'Hoover Commission' and has introduced legislation calling for a new study of the procedures of the Executive Branch of the Federal government to eliminate duplication and waste."

The ranking Member of the Committee on Government Operations, Clarence Brown (R.-Ohio), called Wydler's appointment a "real plus which will add a strong voice to the minority members of this committee who have been pushing for a hard look at the administration of the Executive Branch of Government."

Ford concluded "Congressman Wydler's appointment to a second major committee is further indication of the high regard and esteem in which he is held by the members of the House, on both sides of the aisle."

Wydler commented, "My appointment to this important committee will give me an added opportunity to pursue my fight to eliminate waste in government. On my very first day as a Congressman, I introduced legislation to establish a new 'Hoover Commission'. My appointment to this committee will give me a chance to push this legislation toward passage. It is absolutely essential if we are to have a streamlined, efficient government, and it is my intention to fight with all the force at my command to accomplish this."

A statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford (R-Mich)  
to the University of Michigan Young Republican Club

May 13, 1965

As House Minority Leader in Congress in the so-called age of consensus, I have serious personal convictions in the matter of differences of opinion and dissent in 1965 America.

Difference of opinion creates debate and argument. But for a Republic to survive, something greater is required of its citizens. Our need is for responsible dissent.

In the Nation's Capital, we of the Republican Party recognize the necessity of informed and responsible opposition to the Johnson Administration programs. We mean to fulfill our function as the Party of opposition in a constructive and responsible manner.

We must all recognize a growing threat posed to our society and to the country by irresponsible expressions of dissent in this time of national crisis, specifically regarding Southeast Asia and the Dominican Republic.

It should be sufficient that our Nation's enemies know that the overwhelming majority of Republicans in Congress--the loyal opposition--though opposed to many of the President's domestic programs, support him in the matter of standing firm against aggression. In fact, it is worth commenting that President Johnson might wish for an equal amount of support for his Viet Nam and Dominican Republic stand from members of his own Democratic Party.

I consider it incredible that a source of such irresponsible modern-day "know-nothing" dissent, based on emotional disregard for the morality and facts of the case, should spring from a very few of our university campuses.

And I consider it appalling that much of the leadership for picketing with anti-American slogans in what at times amounts to irresponsible mob action comes from a very small minority of university professors purporting to carry forward the banner of free academic inquiry.

Indeed, a central purpose of universities of free inquiry in our society is to prepare succeeding generations for the assumption of responsibilities as citizens. Whenever our educational institutions fail to inculcate this sense of responsibility in their students, serious trouble for the Republic lies ahead.



This has been the case throughout history. This century offers tragic proof of the penalties which societies and nations pay for not meeting this fundamental requirement for existence.

During week-end demonstrations in Washington this Spring some placards read: "Why Die for Viet Nam?"

How many of us remember the similar question raised by irresponsible voices in Chamberlain's Britain, little over a century ago: "Why die for the Sudentanland?" and "Why die for Danzig?"

We know now, and many of us knew then, that these pacifist voices were serving the purposes of Nazi aggression. The placard-bearers cried for peace while the seeds for Buchenwald and Belsen were taking root.

Today, our so-called "teach-ins" and "peace" demonstrations cry for peace-at-any-price while the seeds of Communist atrocity take root. And yet the appeasers speak for morality.

Others are concerned with the physical uncleanliness of these irresponsible protesters. I am not so much concerned with their personal hygiene as with their moral sterility. For, if we condemn public apathy toward victims of street crimes, what can we say of apathy and disinterest regarding victims of Communist aggression?

It is, of course, an apathy and disinterest shown only by a small, small minority of American professors and students. The so-called teach-ins, which I regret may have begun at my own University of Michigan, are not truly representative of the Nation's university campuses.

However, it remains for responsible leaders of American higher education to make this fact unmistakably clear to our people.

The well-intentioned but unrealistic placard-carrying marchers, who bear no public responsibilities, cannot alter this country's policy in Viet Nam or the Dominican Republic. But a danger exists that they will bring about a damaging loss of confidence in the aims and operation of the country's educational system. Also, their words and actions may lead to a dangerous miscalculation by the enemy of our Nation's course of present and future action. Such miscalculation by the Communists in Peiping and elsewhere could have dire consequences for all mankind.





Certainly, there must always be a place for responsible dissent and free inquiry on our university and college campuses. But the respect of faculty and students for authority and law is essential to the development of good citizenship.

It is not too much to expect university students to understand that along with free academic inquiry goes responsibility to country and society. And it is certainly not too much to expect their professors to know and teach that the prime master of free inquiry in Western society did not walk the streets of Athens carrying a placard asking "Why Die for Marathon?" when his community was threatened.

Indeed, Socrates knew the answer. He was prepared to do battle, and if necessary, die to preserve the freedom of others.

As a member of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, I reassert support of the President's pledge that our Nation will stand firm to guarantee an eventual lasting peace.

So long as there is Communist-promoted infiltration of South Viet Nam or anywhere in the society of free world nations, there can be no negotiations. And, I urge the President to make this unmistakably clear to the world. Agreements can only fail when the Communists negotiate only for domination and we negotiate only for peace.

Gerald R. Ford, M.C.



A statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford (R-Mich)  
to the University of Michigan Young Republican Club

May 17, 1965

As House Minority Leader in Congress in the so-called age of consensus, I have serious personal convictions in the matter of differences of opinion and dissent in 1965 America.

Difference of opinion creates debate and argument. But for a Republic to survive, something greater is required of its citizens. Our need is for responsible dissent.

We must all recognize a growing threat posed to our society and to the country by ~~irresponsible~~ expressions of dissent in this time of national crisis, specifically regarding Southeast Asia.

I consider it incredible that a source of ~~such irresponsible~~ <sup>such</sup> day ~~to~~ <sup>dis</sup> ~~sent~~ based on emotional disregard for the morality and facts of the case <sup>g</sup> should spring from a very few of our university campuses.

And, I consider it appalling that much of the leadership for picketing with anti-American slogans in what at times amounts to brazen and disobedient mob action comes from a very small minority of university professors purporting to carry forward the banner of free academic inquiry.

Indeed, universities of free inquiry in our society have a central purpose of preparing succeeding generations for the assumption of responsibilities as citizens. Whenever our educational institutions fail to inculcate this sense of responsibility in their students, serious trouble for the Republic lies ahead.

This has been the case throughout history. The twentieth century offers tragic proof of the penalties which societies and nations pay for failing to meet this fundamental requirement for existence.

Today, our so-called "teach-ins" and "peace" demonstrations <sup>come at a time</sup> ~~are~~ <sup>when</sup> ~~appeal~~ ~~at any price~~ while the seeds of Communist atrocity take root <sup>in</sup> ~~in~~ <sup>in</sup> Viet Nam, Cuba and other ~~places~~ <sup>places</sup>. ~~Yet, the aggressors~~ <sup>of the world</sup> ~~are~~ <sup>for</sup> ~~freedom~~.

It is, of course, an apathy and disinterest shown only by a small, small minority of American professors and students and are not truly representative of the Nation's university campuses. However, it remains for responsible leaders of American higher education to make this fact unmistakably clear to our people.

-more-



A statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford (R-Mich)  
to the University of Michigan Young Republican Club

May 17, 1965

As House Minority Leader in Congress in the so-called age of consensus, I have serious personal convictions in the matter of differences of opinion and dissent in 1965 America.

Differences of opinion creates debate and argument. But for a Republic to survive, something greater is required of its citizens. Our need is for responsible dissent.

We must all recognize a growing threat posed to our society and to the country by unfounded ~~expressions~~ expressions of dissent in this time of national crisis, specifically regarding Southeast Asia.

I consider it incredible that a source of dissent based on emotional disregard for the morality and facts of the case should spring from a very few of our university campuses.

And, I consider it appalling that much of the leadership for picketing with anti-American slogans in what at times amounts to brazen and disobedient mob action comes from a very small minority of university professors purporting to carry forward the banner of free academic inquiry.

Indeed, universities of free inquiry in our society have a central purpose of preparing succeeding generations for the assumption of responsibilities as citizens. Whenever our educational institutions fail to inculcate this sense of responsibility in their students, serious trouble for the Republic lies ahead.

This has been the case throughout history. The 20th century offers tragic proof of penalties which societies and nations pay for failing to meet this fundamental requirement for existence.

Today our so-called "teach-ins" and "peace" demonstrations come at a time when the seeds of Communist atrocity take root in Viet Nam, Cuba and other parts of the world to threaten freedom.

The dissent is shown by only a small, small minority of American professors and students. It is not truly representative of the Nation's university campuses. However, it remains for responsible leaders of American higher education to make this fact unmistakably clear to our people.

-more-



Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford (R-Mich)  
on proposed reduction of excise taxes  
May 17, 1965

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Republicans favor a reduction of excise taxes which were initially levied as a wartime emergency measure.

If we are to have this reduction in revenue, we must also find a way to reduce non-defense spending to a comparable amount in order to maintain fiscal responsibility.

It must be kept in mind that the United States is committed militarily in two theaters of conflict 6,000 miles apart. And, there are indications that Communist aggression may break out elsewhere in the world.

Our Nation must remain strong and ready to meet any emergency in the battle against Communism. Therefore, we must maintain a fiscal position which will be the foundation for a measured, meaningful military effort at almost any moment.

Congress should carefully weigh the need for a \$4 billion excise tax reduction ~~at this time~~ without a cutback in non-defense spending <sup>at a time</sup> when the Nation is taking a carefully calculated military stand against the forces of Communist aggression in two hemispheres.

# # #



Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford (R-Mich.)  
on proposed reduction of excise taxes.

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

May 17, 1965

Republicans favor a reduction of excise taxes which were initially levied as a wartime emergency measure.

If we are to have this reduction in revenue, we must also find a way to reduce non-defense spending to a comparable amount in order to maintain fiscal responsibility.

It must be kept in mind that the United States is committed militarily in two theaters of conflict, 6000 miles apart. And, there are indications that Communist aggression may break out elsewhere in the world.

Our Nation must remain strong and ready to meet any emergency in the battle against Communism. Therefore, we must maintain a fiscal position which will be the foundation for a measured, meaningful military effort at almost any moment.

Congress should carefully weigh the need for a \$4 billion excise tax reduction without a cutback in non-defense spending at a time when the Nation is taking a carefully calculated military stand against the forces of Communist aggression in two hemispheres.

# # #

Radio-tape statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford  
announcing appointment of Rep. John W. Wydler to Committee on Govt. Opns.

( 1-minute ) May 17, 1965

*As Minority leader I was pleased to endorse*

~~the~~ appointment of Nassau's senior Congressman, John W. Wydler, to  
the highly important Committee on Government Operations <sup>His appointment</sup> is of major  
significance not only to the citizens of his district but to the entire  
Nation.

This committee is a prime factor in seeking more streamlined and  
more efficient government at all levels, including the present powerful  
Executive arm. John Wydler comes to the committee with a highly-regarded  
reputation for his work in seeking to eliminate duplication and waste  
in government.

It is extremely fortunate that a man of Congressman Wydler's ability  
is available for this most important position in Washington.

This is his second major committee assignment in Congress. John also  
serves as a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee, which has  
charge of our Nation's vital national space program.

# # #



Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford (R-Mich)  
on President's labor-management message to Congress

May 18, 1965

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Congress must not rubber-stamp President Johnson's far-reaching proposals in his labor-management message. Full Congressional hearings must be held because of the serious issues involved such as the President's proposed repeal of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The President's proposals for extending the minimum wage need careful analysis as to their impact on inflation, unemployment, poverty, and small business.

I have serious doubts about the workability of selected application of double pay for overtime, as does both labor and industry.

Obviously, Republicans will support, or offer as alternatives to, any proposals that will legitimately strengthen our economy and assist workers who need a minimum protection of government.

We shall oppose impositions by the federal government that injure our economy, indirectly hurt our laboring people, or nullify proper responsibilities of the 50 states.

Also, it is regrettable that the President ignored the problems of agricultural labor in his message to Congress. The need for farm laborers in many parts of our country is acute. The Administration could help alleviate this situation if it chose.

# # #

Telephone statement for radio station WGTO Winter Haven, Florida

(293-4103)

May 20, 1965

This week the President boldly ignored the problems of adequate agricultural worker supply in his labor-management to Congress. At that time I emphasized that he had <sup>dodged</sup> ~~doged~~ the problems facing growers in many states.

While Florida <sup>growers</sup> ~~forwers~~ alone have suffered an estimated four million dollar loss so far this year because of a shortage of harvesters, the Johnson Administration continues to ignore the situation.

Secretary of Labor Wirtz is delinquent in his duty by stubbornly refusing to accept a sensible solution to the tragic lack of skilled labor for harvesting.

While thousands of workers are available in Mexico, the Secretary of Labor blandly refuses to perform his duty not only to the American consumers but to the growers and the free enterprise system.

Republican Congressman Edward Gurney of Florida has introduced a bill that would take away the present iron-fisted and dictatorial power of the Labor Secretary. The bill would permit states to handle the manpower-shortage problem in cooperation with growers and farmers. Ed's proposed law demands immediate approval by the Congress.

Meanwhile, the President, his Democrat Administration and Secretary Wirtz continue to ignore this tragic situation in which citrus and many other crops are going to waste because skilled, available workers are prohibited from harvesting them.

-more-





Today's problems are especially regrettable in view of action taken by the Democrat-controlled Congress which abolished the "bracero" law..... this provided that Mexican nationals be admitted temporarily to the United States to perform a valuable service.

In killing the law, the Democrat-controlled Congress placed almost unlimited dictatorial powers in the hands of the Administration and the Secretary of Labor.

It is a travesty on justice, a violation of responsibility and a shame that the Administration refuses to remedy the present tragic situation in Florida, California, Michigan and other states.....the American people and the growers deserve better treatment.

# # #



Telephone statement for radio station WTOO Winter Haven, Florida

(293-4103)

May 20, 1965

This week the President boldly ignored the problems of adequate agricultural worker supply in his labor-management to Congress. At that time I emphasized that he had doged the problems facing growers in many states.

While Florida growers alone have suffered an estimated four million dollar loss so far this year because of shortage of harvesters, the Johnson Administration continues to ignore the situation.

Secretary of Labor Wirtz is delinquent in his duty by stubbornly refusing to accept a sensible solution to the tragic lack of skilled labor for harvesting.

While thousands of workers are available in Mexico, the Secretary of Labor blandly refuses to perform his duty not only to the American consumers but to the growers and the free enterprise system.

Republican Congressman Edward Gurney of Florida has introduced a bill that would take away the present iron-fisted and dictatorial power of the Labor Secretary. The bill would permit states to handle the manpower-shortage problem in cooperation with growers and farmers. Ed's proposed law demands immediate approval by the Congress.

Meanwhile, the President, his Democrat Administration and Secretary Wirtz continue to ignore this tragic situation in which citrus and many other crops are going to waste because skilled, available workers are prohibited from harvesting them.

-more-



Today's problems are especially regrettable in view of action taken by the Democrat-controlled Congress which abolished the "bracero" law..... this provided that Mexican nationals be admitted temporarily to the United States to perform a valuable service.

In killing the law, the Democrat-controlled Congress placed almost unlimited dictatorial powers in the hands of the Administration and the Secretary of Labor.

It is a travesty on justice, a violation of responsibility and a shame that the Administration refuses to remedy the present tragic situation in Florida, California, Michigan and other states.....the American people and the growers deserve better treatment.

# # #



May 20, 1965

## The Record of House Republicans 1965

Working together with a spirit of optimism, House Republicans have battled overwhelming 2 to 1 odds in voting strength while at the same time becoming a united, articulate, creative, hard-working, and dynamic team in Congress.

Since the election of Rep. Gerald R. Ford of Michigan as House Minority Leader January 4, this year, Republicans have organized and distributed their strength, created meaningful proposed legislation, won national attention for their efforts, brought a strong new sense of responsibility to Congress, and given the Party a victory outlook.

The Republican team is operating on the philosophy of Ford, who detailed the guidelines shortly after his election saying: "We cannot accept the idea that the duty of the opposition party is simply to oppose. This is too narrow and too negative a formulation of responsibility."

Ford also said: "We must do more than respond to the initiatives of the Administration. We must offer alternative measures to cope with national problems. We must press for action to deal with the problems to which the Administration is blind or indifferent."

"Our duty, as we conceive it, is to exert whatever influence we can to guide the Nation toward the goals of freedom, security, peace, and well-being with fiscal responsibility."

Major accomplishments include:

1. Establishment of the Republican Coordinating Committee with the goals of broadening the advisory base of national party policy, setting up task forces to study and make recommendations for dealing with the problems facing the nation, and to stimulate communication among members of the party and others.

2. Formation of the Planning and Research Committee, a major innovation to mobilize constructive Republican activity in developing long-term solutions to national problems.

-more-



3. Organization of a Task Force operation with a special staff to conduct research in depth in many areas, including foreign policy, economic affairs, agriculture, congressional reform and implementation of the 1964 party platform.

4. Reshaping the Policy Committee to handle the day-to-day job of formulating decisions on current legislative proposals facing House decision.

5. Broadening the base of operations and strategically deploying strength, ability and wisdom by providing that no Republican member can serve as the ranking representative on two committees at the same time.

6. Strengthening the Whip organization.

7. Bettering the organization of employees and adding experienced specialists in many fields.

8. Formulating legislative proposals that offer more fiscally-responsible plans for: assisting economically distressed areas, providing health care for senior citizens, aid-to-education, providing a comprehensive and effective remedy in the area of voting rights, offering foreign aid on an "earn and deserve" basis.

9. Support of the Administration's foreign policy in Southeast Asia and the Dominican Republic---and in so doing placed the national interest ahead of partisan politics while the President's own Democrat spokesmen violently oppose him.

Republican growing unity in the House is highlighted in many ways. Two prime examples are voting records on important national issues.

In the first roll-call of the 89th Congress, Republicans were unanimous in voting against selling surplus food to Col Nasser of the Arab Republic.

Republicans, with only 10 dissenting, stood together in voting to substitute the Byrnes Bill for the Administration's medicare scheme.

While working as a constructive, united, creative team, House Republicans have given much more of themselves than they receive, traveling the country strengthening the ranks of the Party in preparation for a victory effort in the 1966 elections.

Although a Democrat-controlled Congress under the iron fist of the President has rammed through legislation that is long on quantity and short on quality, Republicans serve the American electorate by providing objective, responsible opposition in the form of constructive, alternative legislative proposals

Although a Democrat-controlled Congress under the iron-fist of the President has ~~run~~ through legislation that is long on quantity and short on quality, Republicans ~~have~~ serve the American electorate by providing ~~the~~ objective, responsible opposition in the form of constructive alternative legislative proposals.

Republicans in the House are working--- earning the respect of voters in all 50 states.

# # #



Rep. Gerald R. Ford (R-Mich.), House Minority Leader, will testify at a Judiciary subcommittee hearing Wednesday, May 26, in Room 2141 Rayburn Building on proposed legislation that would make the assassination, or attempted assassination, of the President and Vice President a federal crime.

Ford is scheduled to begin his testimony at approximately 10:15 a.m.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R FORD

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Re: Legislation to make the  
assassination of the President  
a Federal crime

May 26, 1965

Mr. Chairman,

The President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy, on which the previous witness, my good friend Representative Hale Boggs, and I were privileged to serve, found that "there was no Federal criminal jurisdiction over the assassination of President Kennedy." (Report, p. 454.)

This fact was dramatically demonstrated to the Commission when we heard testimony concerning activities at the hospital following the President's death. When it was proposed to transfer his body to Washington, local officials insisted that certain papers be filled out and that an autopsy be performed within the State in which the death occurred.

This would have meant a delay of hours or possibly days at a time when the Presidential party was trying to return as quickly as possible to Washington, both for the safety of President Johnson and for the comfort of Mrs. Kennedy.

Presidential staff members who were present decided that they would proceed to remove the body from the hospital without permission of local or State officials. We were told that as the casket was being wheeled through the hall one of the local officials shouted very loudly, "You can't do that; you can't leave here now." Notwithstanding this insistence, the casket was hurried into an ambulance and driven to the airfield.

This embarrassing and disagreeable scene could have been avoided had the legislation which we are considering today been in effect. It seems to me that this is one, but only one, of the reasons why the assassination, or the attempted assassination, of the President should be made a Federal crime.

In the course of my participation and the extensive investigation by the Warren Commission into the assassination of President Kennedy, it became clear that such legislation was long overdue and would produce several significant advantages.

PRESENT LAW

Under present law, it is a Federal offense to deposit in the mails any letter or other document containing a threat, or otherwise to make any threat, against the President, the Vice-President, or other officer next



in order of succession to the office of the President, the President-elect, or the Vice-President-elect. (18 U.S.C. 871.) It is also a Federal crime to conspire to injure any Federal officer, on account of, or while he is engaged in, the lawful discharge of the duties of his office. (18 U.S.C. 372.) In addition, to advocate the overthrow of the Government by the assassination of its officers is a Federal offense. (18 U.S.C. 2385.) But a direct attack upon the President, or even his murder, has never been as such a crime under Federal law. That is to say, unless there has been a conspiracy, or an advocacy of the overthrow of the Government, there is no Federal jurisdiction, so that, as the Warren Report concluded, "...once it became reasonably clear that the killing was the act of a single person, the State of Texas had exclusive jurisdiction." (Report, p. 454.)

The murder of numerous other Federal officials has long been a Federal crime. Section 1114 of Title 18 of the United States Code makes it a Federal offense to kill Federal Judges, U.S. Attorneys and Marshals, and many other specifically designated officials, while engaged in, or on account of, the performance of their official duties.

It should be noted that in all these cases, there is a Federal offense only if the official has been killed while engaged in, or on account of, the performance of his official duties. This "line of duty" requirement is probably necessary for the exercise of Federal jurisdiction as to such officials, but the courts have been fairly liberal in interpreting what conduct falls within this provision of the statute. There have also been several cases under this and a parallel statute, holding that it is not even necessary for the offender to know that the victim was a Federal officer engaged in the performance of his official duties, but the majority rule and the sounder view, seems to be that such knowledge is essential to show a Federal offense.

#### BASIS FOR FEDERAL JURISDICTION

The basic reason for making the assassination of the President a Federal crime is that essentially it is an offense against the United States Government, in two important respects. First, grave injury is done to the functioning of the Government, which may threaten the welfare of the entire country. As Senator George F. Hoar put it over 60 years ago in Congressional debate on a similar bill:

"...What this bill means to punish is the crime of interruption of the Government of the United States and the destruction of its

security by striking down the life of the person who is actually in the exercise of the executive power, or of such persons as have been constitutionally and lawfully provided to succeed thereto in case of a vacancy. It is important to this country that the interruption shall not take place for an hour...." (35 Cong. Rec. 2431 (1902), quoted in Report, pp. 455-56.)

That such interruption may cause grave anxiety is amply demonstrated by the tense hours the nation experienced in November of 1963, and also by the concern over the health of President Johnson and Speaker McCormack until the office of Vice-President was filled again.

Secondly, in most cases, the reason for such attacks is anger at the manner in which the President performs his official functions, or hostility toward the office of President or the United States Government or the American system of democracy. It is certainly the concern of the Federal Government to try to prevent, to guard against, and to punish criminal conduct performed out of such motivation.

#### ADVANTAGES

The change in the present law that would be affected by the proposed legislation would produce several significant advantages.

Primary responsibility and final authority for the investigation and prosecution of any attacks on the life of the President would be placed in the hands of Federal authorities. The actual investigation of offenses covered by the statute would be conducted by Federal law enforcement officials; particularly the FBI, with the assistance of the Secret Service. Where the assistance of State or local agencies proved necessary or desirable, it would be under the direction of the Federal agencies involved. This would ensure that resources and facilities of the Federal agencies would be immediately available for a complete and thorough investigation. "At present, Federal agencies participate only upon the sufferance of the local authorities." (Report, p. 456.) In addition, clear Federal jurisdiction would minimize the possibility of embarrassment or conflict in dealing with local authorities, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover testified before the Warren Commission that, at the time of President Kennedy's assassination, "...the failure to have jurisdiction was extremely embarrassing," (V Hearings, 115) and led to confusion in the subsequent investigation by Federal and local authorities. (Report, p. 546.) In addition, the Commission itself experienced some difficulty in its work, for example, the

unauthorized and premature release of documents and information, which might have been prevented, had Federal authorities been in control.

The threat to the national security of the United States, when the President has been assassinated, may be very serious. The careful assessment of this danger, and taking of whatever steps may be necessary, will be greatly facilitated by allowing the Federal Government to supervise all stages of the investigation and handling of the case. In particular, as Secret Service Chief James J. Rowley pointed out (Comm. Ex. 1030; vol. XVIII, pp. 830-31), the possibility of a conspiracy and any further threat to the President should be explored and eliminated as quickly as possible. This is the particular concern of the Federal agencies which have general responsibility for the President's protection. If it should ever become necessary, the Federal Government could exercise exclusive jurisdiction over the entire investigation, so that information obtained could be kept confidential until its reliability and significance could be fully determined, thus preventing unfounded rumors and unnecessary public confusion.

The detention and protection of any suspects would, under the proposed legislation, be the responsibility of Federal law enforcement officers. Mr. Hoover testified before the Commission that "If we had had jurisdiction, we would have taken custody of him (Oswald) and I do not believe he would have been killed by Rubenstein." (V Hearings, 115.) As he stated, "...the killing of Oswald has created a great fog of speculation that will go on for years, because of the things that Oswald might have been able to tell which would have been of assistance in pinning down various phases of this matter." As one of our most capable law enforcement agencies, the FBI could do much to ensure the safety of possible defendants.

Furthermore, the fact of Federal custody would ensure that the questioning of the suspect would be under the direction of Federal authorities. In Dallas, FBI and Secret Service agents did not have control over the questioning of Oswald, and at times were merely observers; they were not even present when the interrogation of Oswald began. As Chief Curry admitted, the conditions in the Dallas jail were hardly conducive to effective questioning. (Report, p. 200.) In addition, J. Edgar Hoover pointed out that if some of the evidence had been kept secret and Oswald had been confronted with it in his interrogation, he might have broken and confessed. (V Hearings, 116.) Finally, the

facilities of the FBI would have made it more likely that recordings or transcripts of the interrogation sessions would have been made.

The procedures and practice of the Federal agencies would also be well calculated to protect the legal rights of any suspect. It is the practice of the FBI, Mr. Hoover testified, to inform every prisoner of his right to remain silent and to have an attorney; he is also examined by a reputable local physician both before and after his questioning. (V Hearings, 116.) Federal law requires that when a person is arrested he be brought before a commissioner promptly; "...in a case like Oswald's, (this) would probably have been done within 4 or 5 hours." (V Hearings, 116.) In addition, it is highly unlikely under Federal procedures that a suspect's right to a fair trial would be prejudiced by the release of incorrect or inadmissible information. Last April, the Attorney General issued a statement of policy concerning the release of information by personnel of the Department of Justice relating to criminal proceedings. (28 C.F.R. 50.2.) Under the guidelines there established, much of the information which might have unfairly prejudiced a jury against Oswald would never have been released. As it was, much unreliable and actually false information was announced by local officials in frequent press conferences. Mr. Hoover testified that he was so concerned that he asked his agent in charge in Dallas to personally go to Chief Curry and insist that he not go on the air any more until the case was resolved. (V Hearings, 115.) As he explained, "We have always adopted the policy in the Bureau of no comment until we have the warrant and make the arrest. Then a release is prepared briefly stating what the facts are, what the written complaint says,....and that ends it." (Ibid.) Finally, the Federal courts may take measures to protect the defendant from undue publicity. Under Rule 21 (a) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, "if the court is satisfied that there exists in the district or division where the prosecution is pending so great a prejudice against the defendant that he cannot obtain a fair and impartial trial in that district or division," the court must transfer the proceeding to another district or division. The court is also empowered, within its discretion, to grant a continuance of the trial or to impanel a new set of jurors.

#### SUPPORT FOR THE LEGISLATION

The Report of the President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy recommended that Congress adopt legislation which would

make the assassination of the President, the Vice-President or other person next in order of succession, the President-elect, or the Vice-President-elect, a Federal crime. (Report, p. 26; cf. p. 455.) The Director of the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover, strongly supports such legislation. (Report, p.456; V Hearings 115; Comm. Ex. 866, vol. XVII, p. 860.) The Chief of the Secret Service, James J. Rowley, equally favors this recommendation. (V Hearings, p. 483; Comm. Ex. 1030, vol. XVIII, p. 830.)

#### FORM OF THE LEGISLATION

Without going into the particular provisions of the bills before the committee, I would like to indicate the areas I think the legislation should cover. The precise form of the final bill will depend on the extent to which these purposes require modification of the existing laws.

The bill should cover the President, Vice-President or other person next in order of succession, the President-elect, the Vice-President-elect, and any person lawfully acting as President. This would eliminate the need for any "line of duty" restriction, since "the activities of the victim at the time an assassination occurs and the motive for the assassination bear no relationship to the injury to the United States which follows from the act." (Report, p. 455.) (In the Senate-House conference on the 1902 bill, which was not passed, it was agreed no such restriction was needed for the President or Vice-President. (36 Cong. Rec. 2407 (1902), cited in Report, p. 852, n. 222.) The same reasoning should eliminate any requirement that the offender know that his victim is one of the officers within the bill: the harm to the United States is the same; also, it may be impossible to tell for some time whether the attacker knew the identity of his victim, and Federal jurisdiction should not be questioned because of this uncertainty.

The legislation should cover not only premeditated murder, but also any killing or assault or kidnaping, or any attempt or conspiracy to commit any of these acts, since they also present serious danger to the functioning of the Government and the welfare of the country.

The punishment provided for offenses under this statute should be modeled on the general Federal murder and manslaughter penalties (18 U.S.C. 1111, 1112), which are also applicable to the present statute protecting Federal officers (18 U.S.C. 1114). For kidnaping, it would be desirable to provide an optional death penalty if the victim is not returned alive. For assault, of course, the penalty need not be so severe; it could be

modeled on the general statute against assault on Federal officers (18 U.S.C. 111), and should provide a more serious penalty for the use of a dangerous weapon, as does that statute.

There is already a general provision whereby the Attorney General may grant rewards of up to \$25,000 for information leading to the arrest or conviction (or death in course of apprehension) of persons violating the laws of the United States or any State. (18 U.S.C. 3059.) The committee may wish to authorize larger rewards for the present legislation, but it seems unnecessary to make the Attorney General's discretion in this matter unreviewable. It may also be advisable to make local, State and Federal officers and employees eligible for such rewards, so that they may be compensated in appropriate cases.

The legislation should also provide authority for the Federal Government to exercise exclusive jurisdiction for offenses under this statute, wherever it decides this is advisable, at the discretion of the President or his successor, or the Attorney General.

#####

Statement issued by Mr. Reedy

May 27, 1965

"Press Release"

(Reedy, George)

Re: international  
situation

The President met with bi-partisan Congressional leaders at 10:15 a.m. to review with them the international situation on a far-ranging scale. It was one of his periodic meetings to keep Congress informed of all developments affecting the polici(es) of this government.

Secretary Rusk and Secretary McNamara briefed the leaders on the world situation. The two Secretaries covered the political and military situation in Southeast Asia, including Viet-Nam, in Europe, in Africa and in Latin America, including the Dominican Republic. Mr. Bundy reviewed for the leaders his trip to the Dominican Republic and the conclusions drawn therefrom. The members of Congress were given a full opportunity to question the officials who had briefed them and to make suggestions. The floor leaders left at 11:45 to open the session and the others remained for a further question and answer session.

