

**The original documents are located in Box D9, folder “Ford Press Releases - Transcript Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership ("Ev and Jerry" Shows), 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 The Council donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections.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.

To Jerry Ford

FROM ROBERT HUMPHREYS

X3700

For your information, there are only 3 copies made besides the original of the Joint Leadership press conference transcripts. The original and the tape are kept at the National Committee; your office, Senator Dirksen's office and my office get the other 3 copies. Further FYI, these are not available until 24 hours after the press conference but we always make them available to the press when they want to visit my office and look at the transcripts.

THE JOINT SENATE-HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP

SENATOR DIRKSEN - REPRESENTATIVE FORD

January 11, 1965

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, first, just let me say HAPPY NEW YEAR. It's a little belated, but I think it is still in order. We're glad to see you and I hope that at each succeeding Press Conference that we have this room filled. I'm like the preacher - I don't like to see any empty benches when I prepare to hurl some assorted homilies and prophecies at you. So, here we go.

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

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

First, that the only elected Republican officials of the Federal Establishment are the Republican members of the United States



Senate and the House of Representatives. Obviously and beyond dispute, they will guide Republican Party policy at the national level in the absence of a Republican President and Vice President by the record they write in Congress. It is their responsibility.

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

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



STATEMENT BY REP. FORD: May I say at the outset that it's a real pleasure and a privilege to be here and I hope to get better acquainted and see all of you more frequently.

I think it's obvious that Senator Dirksen and I haven't deliberately papered the ~~house~~ <sup>house</sup> this morning. <sup>formal statement</sup> We propose to give the <sup>legis</sup> Republican Party a unified leadership. ~~As~~ <sup>As</sup> a chart we are making public will show, ~~We~~ <sup>We</sup> are inviting the five living Republican nominees for President - one of whom, Dwight D. Eisenhower, served two terms in that office - and representatives of the Republican Governors Association to join with us in the establishment of a Republican Coordinating Committee to continuously examine party policy and party operations.

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

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



issues. The recruiting sources for these task forces, which would report to the Joint Leadership, are clearly delineated on the organization chart which we are making public today.

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



QUESTION: Does your statement mean now that Dean Burch will not be replaced as Republican National Chairman?

REP. FORD: This Republican Coordinating Committee was established without any relationship to that contest that may or may not take place in Chicago in January. The statement, I think, speaks for itself in this regard.

QUESTION: What effect do you think the statement will have on the contest?

REP. FORD: I don't believe it will have any impact one way or another.

QUESTION: Mr. Ford, in what ways does this Coordinating Committee change the role of the Republican National Committee?

REP. FORD: It doesn't have any impact on the responsibilities of the Republican National Committee. This is an attempt by the Joint Senate-House Leadership to better coordinate the efforts of all of the segments of the Republican Party...The former Presidential nominees, the Governors, and Joint Senate-House Leadership.

QUESTION: Does this mean a new job for Dean Burch, or if he leaves, the chairmanship of the National Committee will also go to his successor?

REP. FORD: The statement clearly covers that. This will be an added responsibility of the Republican National Chairman.

QUESTION: Did Mr. Burch sit in on the meeting this morning?

REP. FORD: Yes, Mr. Burch - as the Republican National Chairman - has in the past - did attend our Joint Leadership Meeting... a



National Chairman in the future, of course, will do the same.

QUESTION: Does he go along with this -

REP. FORD: Yes, he has agreed that this is a constructive step to better coordinate our activities.

QUESTION: Mr. Burch, General Eisenhower has... (LAUGHTER)  
(I'll try again!)

Mr. Ford, General Eisenhower has suggested that there should be a new structuring of the Party. Do you know if Dean has given his approval to this restructuring?

REP. FORD: I believe that he is informed as to the content. Whether or not he has specifically approved the chart which has been distributed, I couldn't tell you.

QUESTION: Has the Republican Governors Association given this at least indirect sanction?

REP. FORD: Well they, of course, at their conference in Denver a month or so ago did come up with a suggestion of a meeting with legislative leaders. This is a more specific approach, I think, and it's a broader approach than the one suggested by the governors.

QUESTION: How do you expect to give the Republican Party the new image here with this organization if you put at the top of it a man whom half the Party is trying to repudiate as a symbol of Goldwaterism?

REP. FORD: The Republican National Chairman is the proper person to handle the Coordinating Committee. Ah, the Republican National Chairman, regardless of the person who occupies that post, in my judgment, ought to handle that responsibility.





SENATOR DIRKSEN: Let me amplify a little. Sam, when we set up the Joint Leadership, we didn't want to take the Chairman from either the House or the Senate or have it alternated. As a result, it was agreed that the Republican National Chairman could serve as the Moderator and we regard him as a Moderator only for purposes of recognition of those who are at the meeting and to keep it moving. So the fact that Mr. Burch was present this morning is in line with the pattern and format that we've established a long time ago. He IS the Republican National Chairman. The leadership is in being. There isn't any reason why he shouldn't be there and carry on his accustomed duty as the Moderator.

Now, if for any reason, he should be displaced, whoever the new Chairman might be will serve in that same role. So there is nothing strange about this at all. We're just continuing a pattern that was established when Eisenhower left the White House.

QUESTION: Well, Senator, this seems to be upgrading Mr. Burch. Do you see this as an attempt to rescue him?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: John, this has no effect on it whatsoever. There was no allusion to Mr. Burch or to the meeting in Chicago in January. There was no discussion about it. We just carry on a pattern that has been established a long time ago. And whoever might be the National Chairman, we will go on exactly as we have before. So there is no upgrading, there is no downgrading, and we do not mean for a moment to have any impact upon the deliberations of the National Committee men and Committee women on the 22nd of January.

QUESTION: Is there any indication that he intends to resign?



SENATOR DIRKSEN: None whatsoever. And may I just dispose of all that speculation by saying that at no time this morning was it discussed, there was no allusion to it, we carried on the meeting in the regular pattern that has always obtained.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, the formation on this new Republican Coordinating group implies that while it may recommend up to policy, it will still be ~~make~~ the Joint Senate-House Leadership to decide if those recommendations will be accepted. Is that right?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, the fact of the matter is that policy finally is determined by the way you vote in the House and the Senate... that's really the Party image. Somebody used the word a moment ago... I think we could have done a little more with the image in the form of a record in other days, if you know what I mean. And so, the record, of course, will be actually Party policy in action.

QUESTION: (INAUDIBLE)

SENATOR DIRKSEN: You're alluding to Paul Butler's operation when he set up an Advisory Committee. This is a Coordinating Committee that is designed to pull Personnel and Task Forces together under a leadership... and then the last word must necessarily be ours. Now, how far Paul Butler went in trying to impose the views of the Advisory Committee upon their leadership, I do not know. I know what the attitude of the leadership was because their leadership, let me make it plain, because it was expressed to me in eloquent terms a good many times in a certain room in the Capitol when I sat down with a very distinguished gentleman who at that time was leader of the Senate.



QUESTION: Senator, all the functions of the Coordinating Committee... aren't they functions which ordinarily would be carried out by the National Committee?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Definitely not. First of all, the National Committee is the operating body between conventions. So much of its function is administrative in character and it hasn't undertaken to establish policy...

QUESTION: This was not establishing policy but coordinating --

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, we are coordinating effort here... at every level of the Party. Now if you look on that chart, you'll notice that we make provision for a task force, the idea there is that you secure people in the Party and out of the Party who have peculiar knowledge on any given subject that is going to be a matter of some controversy when it comes to both the House and the Senate.

QUESTION: (EVERYBODY TALKS AT ONCE)

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Now, wait a minute... one at a time...

QUESTION: Senator, who are the five Republican Governors...

SENATOR DIRKSEN: ... has not been determined and probably that ought to be determined by the Governors Association itself.

QUESTION: Senator, what specific projects would you like to see these task forces do within 6 to 9 months, say?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I don't propose to enumerate them. If I did, I'd probably have to read you the State of the Union Message. But I'll just give you one. Wright Patman will introduce a proposal very shortly with respect to our gold reserve. Now that is a matter that is



going to brook some real controversy and it's a field where you've got to find people who have expert knowledge - and there you have an example of where you can well recruit a task force for purposes of measuring the impact of that policy, whether it's good or bad for the country, intrinsically or psychologically, and give us the benefit of their advice.

QUESTION: (Inaudible)

SENATOR DIRKSEN: They will recommend, of course, to the Joint Leadership, because obviously we're going to have to do the voting, we have to make the determination, and it's got to come to us.

QUESTION: ... spokesmen for this Coordinating Committee... Will the National Chairman be the spokesman?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: He will be spokesman, certainly, in a sense... in first appointing personnel, appointing task forces, accepting recommendations and so forth, and generally keeping the thing into a good, cohesive administrative pattern.

QUESTION: How soon do you expect it to be functioning?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, you will notice in Congressman Ford's statement that the invitation to the National Chairman to make these invitations is almost immediate.

QUESTION: Senator, is it true that the "Ev and Jerry Show" is due for a limited engagement...we won't be seeing you much any more?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Why, Roger, you'll probably be seeing us a lot more maybe... (LAUGHTER)... well, wait a minute, let me finish. Because if the President is anxious to have a Short Session and get the boys out of the trenches, so to speak, that means that it will be a



working Session and that means that we'll have a lot of things to talk to you about and statements to be made on policy matters.

QUESTION: Is it Representative Ford's intention to have weekly "Ev and Jerry?"

SENATOR DIRKSEN: It's our JOINT intention to do so.

QUESTION: Have you thought of any new angles of the program, Senator?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Now, don't you go saying "TOM AND JERRY!"

(LAUGHTER)

REPRESENTATIVE FORD: Roger, may I answer at least in part your question. I want to be very clear. Senator Dirksen and I have worked together in the past, we will certainly work together in the future. We will very specifically have Joint Leadership Meetings in the future... they will be periodic and they will cover the matters of dual interest to both the House and the Senate. On the other hand, the House leadership will undoubtedly hold some periodic meetings and it's quite possible that we'll invite you all to join us at those particular meetings.

QUESTION: Mr. Ford, doesn't the idea of the task forces of the Coordinating Committee ruffle a little the task forces your new leadership in the House is creating?

REP. FORD: Not at all. They certainly shouldn't be in conflict. I would hope and trust they would coordinate their efforts. I don't think we'll do any duplication because I'm on this particular Coordinating Committee and I think I'll have something to say about the task forces that we have as far as the House is concerned.



QUESTION: To name a specific example. You already have a task force working on a Republican alternative on Medicare. Does this mean the Republican Coordinating Committee would not touch Medicare, then?

REP. FORD: This decision hasn't been made. We had the minority members of the House Committee on Ways and Means, who are the authorities in this field, now working on alternatives as far as Medicare is concerned. This is something that might come up very quickly in the House... I would doubt that this particular Coordinating Committee task force would have time, under the circumstances, to tackle that problem.

QUESTION: Mr. Ford, when you have a conflict come up in the Coordinating Committee... how much weight is given to the Congressional Representative who represents the National Committee, the Presidential nominee and any other persons involved?

REP. FORD: I think the final judgment as to whether we accept in part or in whole the recommendations will depend upon what the members of the House and Senate themselves feel ~~is~~ concerning the task force reports.

QUESTION: Can you tell us who you recommend for the House Whip and the House -

REP. FORD: No decision has been made by me at this time on that problem.

QUESTION: I'm not clear about this thing yet. Is this merely a proposal, or is this an accomplished fact? If the Governors have not yet agreed to this, if the former Presidential candidates have



not yet agreed to serve, is this just a proposal -

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, Jeffrey, the statement is clear...

QUESTION: Not to me -

SENATOR DIRKSEN: We have on this day initiated a proposed mechanism. This don't spring Phoenix-like out of the atmosphere, full-blown overnight... we were setting this thing in motion today.

QUESTION: But it hasn't been cleared in advance from the other groups -

SENATOR DIRKSEN: There have been informal discussions, but that doesn't mean that all has been settled. But it will be settled, we hope in reasonably short order.

QUESTION: May I follow with another question. Despite what you said about the National Committee's administrative function, officially it is the governing body of the Party. Don't you think the members of the National Committee will be offended to have no membership on this other than the Chairman sitting as the umpire of the meeting?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, the Chairman will represent the National Committee, and I expect if that is the desire, you can add to it, if you like. But we're initiating this proposal now. There will be some suggestions, I'm sure, as to whether it ought to be enlarged in one respect or another, but you can't quite say this is a fully accomplished fact as it stands on the paper, because any proposition of this kind is obviously subject to adjustment.

QUESTION: Do I understand you correctly to say that Dean Burch will name the personnel of the task forces?



SENATOR DIRKSEN: If he were the National Chairman and after consultation with every interested body here, you would hit upon somebody you would want on the task force... and frankly, that is going to offer no great difficulty, it never has...

QUESTION: Senator, this report says the Republican ~~NATIONAL~~ National Committee will finance this Coordinating Committee. What is to prevent them from cutting off the money from any proposals that don't fit in with their Goldwater...

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Oh, I suppose if they were a capricious and arbitrary group they might think along that line, but I anticipate no such action. I anticipate no such attitude, as a matter of fact. Because, if that were the case, certainly this wouldn't become a very coordinating body, but that's the proper source from which it ought to be financed.

QUESTION: ... final power... ~~but~~ by putting them in charge of the purse strings?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, they aren't in final power so far as purse strings are concerned, because if, perchance, that question should ever arise (and frankly, I can't even imagine it with my feeble imagination) other efforts would be made to finance, and that shouldn't be too difficult. Having had four years of experience on the Senatorial Campaign Committee as its Chairman, I never ran into any difficulties on that score, and...

QUESTION: Do you have any idea, Sir, how much it will cost...

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I do. And I'll answer that by saying a substantial sum is going to be allocated for this purpose.





QUESTION: About task forces... will you have one on foreign policy, or will you have one on Viet-Nam... and all down the line?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, it's hard to tell how many you will have, but I fancy there'll be quite a number, because we expect, of course, to pick people on these task forces who have expert knowledge in the field, and one man may have expert knowledge in that field, another in the fiscal field, another in the educational field, another in the labor field... so in proportion as we need them, we'll have them set up.

QUESTION: Senator, will they be pretty much ad hoc committees, or task forces, or will they be continuing -

SENATOR DIRKSEN: John, you'll have to tell me what "ad hoc" means...

QUESTION: (INAUDIBLE)

SENATOR DIRKSEN: The public doesn't know and I don't know.

QUESTION: What happened to the idea we were kicking around here last month... shadow Cabinet -

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Shadow Cabinet?

QUESTION: We were talking about that last month -

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Andy, I haven't even heard of the Shadow Cabinet. Are you speaking now of the legislative branch, or the executive branch?

QUESTION: Well, a Shadow Cabinet for the Executive Branch - made up of leading Republican statesmen...

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I've seen it alluded to... but insofar as I know, nothing has happened in that field.

QUESTION: Senator, will National Defense be a subject for your task force, or -

SENATOR DIRKSEN: No, I think it would be a proper subject for a task force, because it would involve, first of all, the expenditure, the disposition of your various Defense components, the taking out of being these bases that is a matter of some controversy now, the emerging of the National Guard and Reserve components... you've got a good many things in the Defense field to which you can invite a task force that has some expert knowledge.

QUESTION: (Inaudible)

SENATOR DIRKSEN: May I say to you that the National Committeeman and the National Committeewoman of Illinois are Party officials and they are selected at the National Convention by the delegates. Far be it from me to undertake to usurp their powers or to impose my judgment and my will upon them. And for good measure, let me point it up finally by saying I have not even talked to either one as to what their disposition is.

QUESTION: Are you satisfied with the present Chairman?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I said I have not imposed my disposition and, therefore, I would not by word or deed, by action or whisper... (LAUGHTER)... undertake to influence the deliberations at Chicago.

QUESTION: Senator, would you see such a Committee eliminate any need for a Mackinaw Island type of policy?



SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, we had only one Mackinaw Island conference, and I was there. I can say in the light of hindsight that, first, it was too large, secondly, it was too far afield, third, it was too difficult to get to, and fourth, the results were so diffused when we got through that I had some doubts about its value.

QUESTION: (Inaudible)

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, we could have held it in Saigon...

(LAUGHTER)

QUESTION: (Inaudible)

SENATOR DIRKSEN: No, the statement is clear on that point. We have heard these expressions of the needs of the Republican Party as it prepares for 1966 and beyond, and we believe some action is necessary and this is our method to impart vigor and strength and knowledge into the operations of the Party.

QUESTION: Thank you.



THE JOINT SENATE-HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP

SENATOR DIRKSEN - REPRESENTATIVE FORD

March 18, 1965

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

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

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



Federalized schools, text books, and teachers, Federalized zoning, building codes, health centers, and transportation, Federalized libraries, laboratories, auditoriums and theaters - - all these and much more are now in prospect for our states and local communities. In time our state and local governments can only be reduced to resident agents for the huge central authority in Washington.

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

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



STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN: May I say by way of prelude that both of these statements are somewhat general in character, but it is done for a purpose. It is by way of establishing a predicate for statements to follow that will be more specific. We've done a good deal of research work and developed background data and now, from time to time, it will follow almost the format that is used when the President, for instance, sends down his State of the Union Message and then follows up with specific messages on a great many fields of activity.

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

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

How big is government today? The answer is simply: It's enormous.

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



The impact of the Federal government alone is startling: Federal aid to State and local governments has risen from \$3.8 billion in 1956 to... I re-emphasize the amount... \$3.8 billion... to \$13.6 billion for 1966 - - and that's only a space of 10 years, but it's an increase of 260 percent. Federal funds now amount to 14 percent of the total state-local revenue.

These figures give some idea of the size of government today. Right now the Federal government has more civilian employees in 30 of the 50 states than do the states themselves, and that includes the five biggest in the Union - - California, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois and Ohio.

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

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



QUESTION: (Inaudible)

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Oh, not state employees... it was a question of residence...

QUESTION: (Inaudible)

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I thought so - and my staff thought so - and it must have been an inadvertance, although there are others who felt it was deleted. But when you have 15 or 20 people around the table and you're talking in groups and talking in concert, sometimes those little slips happen. But, in any event, it can be easily cured...

QUESTION: (Inaudible)

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Oh, no... Oh, no... not for one moment, and I hope you make that perfectly clear.

QUESTION: ... the intention is they should be state residents -

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, Tony, the logic from my point of view is simply this: That if you took an examiner from one state and sent him to another state under Civil Service auspices where the problem really was... how easy it would be to accuse you of carpetbagging, and that's just one of those things that I, for one, do not like to inherit.

QUESTION: (Inaudible)

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, it could be. Now, it goes back to just a little misunderstanding, but I shall try to cure it, of course, in the Committee itself when we take up the bill.

QUESTION: (Inaudible)

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Dick, that whole matter was pretty thoroughly discussed and, of course, I think you can cite the scripture





in order to establish the point... but to what extent that takes place. I don't know. But that would have been notably true if, for instance, we had let that provision stand... that among others he could appoint, or the Civil Service Commission could finger and add an additional duty to Federal Employees. And I cited the fact you might ask a rural mail carrier in a small community.... Well, he's got so many patrons. Suppose they met him out in front at the box when he came by and said if this is what you're going to do, so far as I'm concerned you're just off of my list and if I were you I'd just get right with the Lord and I would resign as an Examiner... so, you see, that element CAN come into the picture.

QUESTION: Senator, can you say what it is you plan to do in Committee?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I have suggested that we hold hearings in the full Committee - rather than in Sub-committee. And I earnestly hope that view will prevail. That will shorten the time somewhat, it will give every member of the Committee who wishes to attend a chance to hear ALL of the testimony.

QUESTION: Senator, I'm sorry... I mean with regard to the state residency requirement. You said it can be easily cured -

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Oh! Well, it can be easily cured provided that is the will of a majority of the Committee.

QUESTION: Can I ask Mr. Ford if he supports the bill that Senator Dirksen has -

REP. FORD: I think it's appropriate to say first that we all know the President, when he spoke to us Monday night, said he was



sending up a law... if that were the case, it wouldn't make any difference whether I introduced a bill or not.

I'm not introducing a bill... on the other hand, I think my record and the record of the Republicans in the House is clear... we believe there MUST be legislation, effective legislation, passed early, so that we can get the target of the Republican Party, which is all people registered to vote in all 50 states by 1966.

Now, the Republicans in the House - early in the Session - introduced some 20 bills to ensure the right of all citizens of all states to register and vote. We have appointed a Republican Task Force in the House that has been working on legislation. I have been in consultation with Senator Dirksen almost daily and Congressman McCulloch, the Senior Republican on the Committee on the Judiciary, has likewise been consulting constantly with Senator Dirksen.

We believe that we can develop a bill within the framework of this legislation and we think the House ought to work its will on whatever legislation we can come up with to achieve the purpose that we believe in.

QUESTION: ... there have been some rumbles that some House Republicans don't agree with this approach... 50 percent is too high...

REP. FORD: There is no substantial disagreement with the bill, although we think we ought to work our OWN will along with the members of the Democratic Party in the House and, as you know, hearings started today... the Republicans urged that hearings be held early... and we didn't object to their not being held when the House was sitting. So we're in favor of immediate action for an effective bill.



QUESTION: ... you have reservations... will you be a little more specific...

REP. FORD: At this point I think it's better that I don't pinpoint any areas where there might be disagreement. The members of the Committee on the Judiciary on our side will work their will in the Committee hearings and we on the floor.

I think the most important thing is that Senator Dirksen and I - along with the House Republicans and the Senate Republicans - are urging immediate action on legislation which will attack the problem effectively in every state of the Union.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Let me amplify... You should remember that they do not have dual sponsorship in the House as we do in the Senate. So there is no particular point in introducing a great quantity of bills that are identic in text... when one bill is introduced, that is enough.

In the Senate, however, you can get as many co-sponsors as are willing to go on a bill and that puts it in a considerably different frame.

QUESTION: Mr. Ford, wouldn't it help speed immediate action if you had a specific proposal from the Republican side?

REP. FORD: I don't think so. They do have the bill that was sent up by the President and Attorney General Katzenbach... this is the vehicle upon which hearings are being held. After they've had testimony from the proponents... opponents... then the Committee will work its will and they have "a" vehicle plus some 20 Republican proposals that have been in the mill since January 4th. I think there's ample basis



upon which a good piece of legislation can evolve.

QUESTION: Mr. Ford, are you concerned with all this bipartisanship the Republicans may lose some of the political threat for this legislation?

REP. FORD: I'm not at all concerned about that as long as we get GOOD legislation. If we have the right kind of legislation, the Republicans AND the Democrats will get appropriate rewards.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen -

SENATOR DIRKSEN: (Interrupts) I want to... let me answer Bill This by saying that a similar question was addressed, I think, to Thomas Jefferson and after discussing, he said: "The approbation which may have been long denied will be forthcoming."

So it's not a question of credit, it's a question of getting a job done.

Sam had a question -

QUESTION: ...It has been charged (I think even in such a conservative journal as the WALL STREET JOURNAL) that the Republican alternatives to the "Great Society" are vastly more costly, would take much more money out of the Treasury...

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Who said that? (LAUGHTER)

QUESTION: THE WALL STREET JOURNAL!

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Oh, no, now... you said it was in the WALL STREET JOURNAL ... authoritative publication. Now... (Senator and Questioner talking at once)... Now, whose by-line was it?

QUESTION: ... the schools. (LAUGHTER) ... the school bill will be vastly more expensive than the Administration school bill...



Medicare more expensive than the hospital care... and the Regional Rehabilitation Aid Program promoted by the Republicans will be more expensive. I'm not saying this is so... I say the charge has been made... now, what is the answer?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, Sam, I ought to put you on the stand and avail myself of all evidenciary rules and then we would come to grips with this. Because we're just dealing with a lot of figures in thin air, which I do not accept as authoritative at all. After 17 years on the Appropriations Committee of the House and Senate, I can tell you that when you break these figures down they come out rather differently, and so I'm not going to be in the position of generalizing until I see a specific, because it makes all the difference in the world. And I say that without my tongue in my cheek and without forfeiting my high regard for that very eminent newspaper, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL.

(LAUGHTER)

REP. FORD: Senator, I would like to respond to Sam's comment. If you take the Administration's so-called "Medicare" Bill and provide the same benefits that the Byrnes proposal does, the Administration proposal - with the same benefits - would be at least a third more costly... the Republican Byrnes proposal... because it is not mandatory, it is not compulsory... and because something like 20 percent of the people will avail themselves of the option not to belong, the cost will be substantially less if the Byrnes proposal were enacted into law.



QUESTION: (Inaudible)

SENATOR DIRKSEN: You mean for... well, for enactment of the bill, or for concluding deliberations in the Senate...

QUESTION: Either one -

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, let me just spell out... If we take the full time and from Monday until April 9 - excluding Saturdays and Sundays - is actually 15 working days. Now assume it comes back on the calendar and it will come back because this motion is going to be agreed to by the Senate.

Now you could set it the following Monday - that would be 10, 11, 12, I suppose - and then you reason from there on. And I must be so frank as to confess a slight difficulty, because early in the year - back in January - we agreed upon a recess period for Easter, which begins on the 18th after the close of business and runs, I believe, until the 21st. Now, I'd probably have to fortify myself on the card and see...

QUESTION: (Inaudible)

SENATOR DIRKSEN: That's right... conclusion of business on April 15 until noon, Wednesday, April 21. Now from the 12th... say, Monday to the 15th... is three days. Can you finish in that time... and having announced this so long ago, are we really at liberty where members have made their plans for speeches and all the other attributes of this business, to cancel out the Easter Recess? I have some grave doubts about it - nor do I believe that Easter period is going to be fateful. Because I appraise the temper of the Senate... I do



not believe there will be a filibuster... I do not believe there will be even what I am pleased to refer to euphemistically as "extended discussion." I think the fever is in the air and they're going to dispose of this matter and it won't take too long. But I'm afraid I'd be a prophet without honor in my own country if I tried to tell you that on a given date we're going to finish action on the bill.

QUESTION: You're apt to be here all summer -

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I'm confident that we're not.

QUESTION: (Inaudible)

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Louder -

QUESTION: Saturday being the first day of spring, do you have any comment on that? (LAUGHTER)

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I have only one comment. I have discovered that tulip bulbs don't do very well if you have to use a pickaxe to put them in. (LAUGHTER) And so I'm afraid that feeling of nostalgia I get everytime I see a hyacinth pop his bold little head above the soil... is not going to be requited and I shall be a very impatient person.

But I will say to you where all the world can hear... that after these long sessions in my office day after day... getting out sometimes at midnight... that I could use a little rest.

QUESTION: Thank you.

QUESTION: Senator, if by some chance there were a filibuster, how long would it go on?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Oh, I'd rather not speculate on it because I do not believe it's going to be necessary, but we'll come to that bridge and cross it when necessary.



Transcript

JOINT SENATE-HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP

Senator Dirksen - Representative Ford

May 20, 1965

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN: Why, John, you ought to feel my muscle. That hospital makes a bum out of me. Well, gentlemen, if you're ready, I'm ready:

From the time the President decided to send forces into the Dominican Republic to protect lives and to thwart the danger of a Communist take-over in that country, the Republicans in Congress have given him their support.

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

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

Even now, in its reaction to events in the Dominican Republic, the Administration is not manifesting awareness of the extent and the danger of Castro-exported Communist subversion in at least a half a dozen countries ... dozen American nations. In the past three years, many thousands of citizens of other Latin American countries have received para-military and ideological training in





Cuba and have been sent home to carry on subversion, terrorism, and guerrilla warfare in Central and South America. Since the end of November 1964, there has been renewed emphasis by Cuba on the use of violence to obtain political power, particularly in Venezuela, Colombia, and Guatemala. In Guatemala, the activities of 500 terrorists and guerrillas led to the establishment of a state of siege in February of this year. Haiti, Panama, Paraguay, El Salvador, and Honduras are all announced targets of Communist violence.

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

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

We urge the Administration to present such a plan of action to the O.A.S. before the tragic drama of the Dominican Republic is replayed in other Latin American nations.

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE FORD: ... on May 20, 1902, Cuba assumed the status of an independent Republic with the inauguration of its first president.

On this anniversary, we call for the reestablishment of Cuban independence. Since late 1960 the present government of Cuba has been a military, economic, political vassal of the Soviet Union. Today



thousands of foreign Communist military personnel remain on Cuban soil. Cuba's rulers continue to serve the purposes of an alien system by carrying on a campaign of terrorism, sabotage, subversion, and sporadic warfare against their neighbors, disturbing the peace of the hemisphere and threatening the security of all Americas.

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

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

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

The Administration should fix clearly so that all can see the objective of its policy toward Cuba. The isolation of the Castro regime and the prevention of the export of Communism from Cuba should



be pursued more vigorously as an immediate objective. But the ultimate objective can be nothing less than the elimination of the Communist government in Cuba and the restoration of independence under a government freely elected by the Cuban people.

This objective is dictated by policies subscribed to by all the nations of the hemisphere in Caracas in 1954. The Caracas Declaration stated, "... the domination or control of the political institutions of any American State by the international communist movement, extending to this Hemisphere the political system of an extracontinental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and the political independence of the American States, endangering the peace of America..."

In compliance with this Declaration, or doctrine, President Eisenhower said on July 9, 1960, "... Nor will the United States in conformity with its treaty obligations, permit the establishment of a regime dominated by international Communism in the Western Hemisphere."

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



Q: Mr. Ford, are you asking the United States military to intervene in Cuba to overthrow Castro and, if not, how would you propose that the Castro regime be eliminated?

FORD: This is a matter of the highest policy formulation in our government. The Republican Leadership of the House and the Senate have some constructive suggestions which we would be delighted to present to President Johnson.

I might point out that at the meeting two weeks ago last Sunday at the White House, some suggestions were made by Republicans that resulted in the Administration making recommendations to Congress, including the request for additional military appropriation. This was a Republican suggestion and we would be more than willing - and are very anxious - to sit down with the President and make specific suggestions to the Administration to achieve the objectives that we have indicated in our statements.

We feel that because of the importance of this whole policy matter that these suggestions should not be discussed in public but should be given to the President personally and we as Republicans are anxious and willing to do so.

Q: Your statement seems to imply that all of the events of the ... Dominican Republic ... be..... Castro. (NOTE: Question not clear... voice almost inaudible.)

FORD: Well, it's perfectly obvious to anyone that Castro is the fire-starter, he's the arsonist in the whole Caribbean area. And until you take steps to isolate and eliminate the arsonist, we are not



going to have peace in the future in the Caribbean.

Q: Do you think if there were no Castro there would be no Dominican revolt?

FORD: I'm convinced that if Castro hadn't taken over in Cuba and carried out the kind of subversion that he's carried out - as indicated in Senator Dirksen's statement and mine - we wouldn't have the kind of troubles we're having in the Caribbean today, including the Dominican Republic.

Q: Congressman, are you proposing a blockade perhaps - by the OAS - of Cuba?

FORD: The Republicans... within the last year... on two occasions and more immediately within the last three weeks - have recommended that an OAS joint force be set up for immediate availability to move in on an OAS basis to meet the threats of the kind that developed in the Dominican Republic. This is one suggestion that's on the record and we think it would be constructive at this time. The Administration has gone along with this and is trying to achieve it. I would personally endorse it very strongly.

Q: How would you isolate Castro... (NOTE: Rest of question not clear.)

FORD: To get back to the answer that I made a few minutes ago. We DO have specific recommendations, but they are of a major policy determination, and we think it can be most constructively achieved by personal consultation and recommendation with President Johnson.



Q: ... your access to the White House. Is there anything keeping you from going to the President?

FORD: Well, we've been invited down there several times to consult on foreign policy matters. Unfortunately - on some occasions - it's been a consultation subsequent to a determination of policy. We think it would be far more constructive if we were brought in prior to the determination of policy. This was one of the major objections, if you may remember, that was voiced a few years ago by the late Senator Vandenberg... he didn't feel that we as Republicans should assume a responsibility for a policy determination after the fact, and we think in this instance we could be helpful prior to.

Q: Well, Mr. Ford, have you asked for a session with the President to give these proposals?

FORD: We have not as yet, but we intend to by this method and other means - to make this suggestion.

Q: (Not clear)

FORD: I can reply to that by saying that every Republican in the House of Representatives and every Republican in the Senate voted for the additional \$700 million dollars in military appropriations. The only "No" votes were 7 in the House - all Democrats - and 3 in the Senate - all Democrats. So the Republicans, even though a very small number, may have had a question or two, did go along as a show of unanimous support for the President's request for additional military appropriations.



QL (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: Well, whatever the situation in the Dominican Republic requires for the purpose of restoring stability and meeting the Communist threat down there, that of course is something for the Executive Branch to do. And whatever they do in that field, I concur with.

Now you are raising a question here about what we can do with respect to the Cuban situation. You know, the old Mark Twain story that you befriend a homeless dog and he won't bite you; you befriend a homeless man, or one who is down on his uppers, and maybe he will. That's the difference between a man and a dog.

Well, I see that crop out now because the Argentine Chamber of Deputies only this week has assailed us and refuses to join in the OAS effort, and in addition, the Chamber in Venezuela can't even make up its mind. All right, think of all the aid and comfort and help they've had from the United States. It's just about time that we re-examine our premises in this matter, and if that's all the gratitude, all the appreciation, all the assistance we're going to have, then I think it's up to us to let the American people know - and also to make a determination of that matter. The idea of handing it out with your right hand and getting a slap from the other side has no appeal to me and that runs through this entire foreign aid program.

So let's take a little realistic look and see and what we can expect from OAS and whether they're willing to come forward now with assistance to the United States.



Q: May I ask a question along that? Do you view the Ford-McCulloch (?) substitute as a threat to the Dirksen-Mansfield Bill of Rights Bill? (NOTE: Not too clear.)

DIRKSEN: Did you say a "threat?"

Q: Yes.

DIRKSEN: (Laughs a little) Well, I haven't the slightest idea. I think it's going to be offered by Senator Tower, and it commends itself to some members of the Senate - how many, I do not know. We're getting quite a bill stacked up there in the Senate... if they adopt any more amendments - and particularly when I'm away from the roost. (LAUGHTER)

Q: Well, but do you feel that you can defeat the Tower Amendment...

DIRKSEN: Well, Sam, that I don't know. It depends. It'll get some votes on our side of the aisle. It was discussed at the policy luncheon the other day and I know that it commends itself to some of our members. Now I've made no nose count, consequently, I can't tell you how the vote would go.

Q: But you ARE opposed to the -

DIRKSEN: Well, I am opposed to it, of course. How could I do other? After all... this substitute is partly my handiwork.

Q: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: Oh, I doubt it very much. We'll have to do whatever events call for, and I don't think of it in the frame of a dictatorship - either from the right or from the left.

Q: (Not clear)





DIRKSEN: Well, we think the Administration has been wanting in some respects. We think its uptake has been slow and that ought to be improved, and we say that because this is the dominant country on this hemisphere. I still believe - even if others take exception - that there IS such a thing as a Monroe Doctrine and that the establishment of a Communist-dominated government on this hemisphere is alien to the policy that we pursued since 1823.

Q: Senator, what good news did you get at the hospital?

DIRKSEN: Well, the good news is that they found exactly nothing, so I languish when these functional failures come on, but I must say that the rest did me some good. But I'm not going to tell you any further stories about the hospital. (LAUGHTER)

Q: Do you have the vote for cloture?

DIRKSEN: I saw the petition this morning. There are 26 names presently. I rather think at this stage - if the cloture petition is filed on Friday - that there will be sufficient votes on Monday because the Senate, frankly, is quite weary of having this measure before it any longer. They're adding nothing constructive nor does the discussion from here on out add anything particularly to the enlightenment of the Senate or of the country, or for that matter, of you.

Q: Senator Dirksen, do you think an OAS military force...

(Note: rest of question not clear.)

DIRKSEN: Well, I think so, because we feel a real kinship to all the Republics in this hemisphere, and we can best serve by having an OAS force. The amazing thing is that that matter has not been pursued with vigor before.

JOINT SENATE-HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP

SENATOR DIRKSEN - REPRESENTATIVE FORD

June 18, 1965

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN: To date, the Republicans in Congress have publicly supported the Administration's policy toward South Vietnam in the belief that it was in harmony with that enunciated by the Congress in Joint Resolution.

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

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

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

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

Senator Fulbright suggests the Geneva Agreements of 1954 "in all their specifications" as a basis for settling the conflict in Vietnam. But this Agreement, as Secretary Rusk acknowledged in



1962, contained a fatal flaw in providing veto power to the Communist member of the international commission established to supervise the execution of the terms of the Geneva settlement.

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

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

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



STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD: Of all the things that Senator Fulbright had to say, none was more revealing than his criticism of the Eisenhower Administration for encouraging the South Vietnamese government to refuse to permit the holding of a nationwide election in Vietnam in 1956.

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

The criticism boils down to a complaint that the United States government failed to exert pressure on the South Vietnamese to surrender to the Communists nine years ago.

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

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

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

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

In February of 1960, Senator Mansfield's Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reported (and I quote):



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

Finally, a major policy paper, issued by the State Department in December of 1961, stated flatly that (and I quote): "The years 1956 to 1960 produced something close to an economic miracle in South Vietnam. . . It is a report of progress over a few brief years equalled by few young countries."

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



QUESTION: (Inaudible)

FORD: I wouldn't say that we repudiate the Geneva accords (?), but we simply believe that if they are to be carried out, they must be carried out affirmatively and effectively and not result in a Communist domination of South Vietnam OR North Vietnam.

QUESTION: (Inaudible)

FORD: I think it depends upon the definition of "free elections." Free elections from our point of view would mean the kind of elections where the Communists would not be able to by pressure of one sort or another actually result in the take-over of Vietnam. A Communist definition of free elections is quite different. They would by one means or another actually not permit a free election - they never have in any instances where elections have been held, and I'm sure they wouldn't in this circumstance.

QUESTION: Mr. Ford, your colleague in the House Republican Leadership, Representative Laird, has recently said that the Republicans are dangerously close to breaking with the Administration on Vietnamese policy. How would you... would you care in any way to associate yourself with that statement?

FORD: The Eisenhower-Dalles policy in reference to South Vietnam never envisaged large-scale, ground warfare in Southeast Asia, including South Vietnam. I agree with that policy. Mr. Laird agrees with that policy. The Republicans today do support



a strong, firm policy against Communist aggression in Southeast Asia. I agree wholeheartedly with that. But this does not mean under any circumstances that we give to any President - Mr. Johnson or otherwise - carte blanche authority in the future. We believe that the American people, members of the Congress, both Democrat and Republican, ought to be fully informed as to our objectives, and what our policy will be in the future. And as long as the American people are properly informed and members of the House are given full opportunity to express themselves, to know the background, we will stand with the President where such a policy is carried out.

QUESTION: Mr. Ford, in the absence of large ground troops, how would you hope to carry out any firm policy?

FORD: I would raise questions whether we..... (NOTE: tape blank for a few seconds here.) ... to achieve certain military objectives. I think we ought to raise the question whether or not we are maximising the utilisation of our allies in Southeast Asia for the achievement of opposing Communist aggression in Vietnam.

QUESTION: The Geneva Agreement had a provision that no country would build up its forces... and President Eisenhower kept that from '54 to '60... the forces were built up by Kennedy and Johnson. Do you consider this a mistake?

FORD: The Geneva Accord did provide that neither side should bring in more weapons, should bring in more troops... the



Eisenhower-Dulles policy was to keep our forces and our equipment at the level that existed in 1954.

Of course, the Communists did violate that Agreement from the very outset. They brought in more troops, they brought in more weapons, and they placed in jeopardy as a result the South Vietnamese Government and our own forces.

In May of 1961 there was a distinct change in our policy in South Vietnam. At that time we had approximately 500 U.S. Military Advisers in South Vietnam. Since that time - since that change of policy - we have built up to the present position where we now have approximately 60,000 or more or less - U. S. Military Personnel there.

It seems to me that the President has to take what steps are necessary to protect our own military forces in South Vietnam. And since the Communists have violated from the first instance, I think this was a necessary step.

QUESTION: Congressman, you raised the question of the effective use of our air and sea power. How do you react to Senator Goldwater's statement that perhaps Hanoi ought to be considered as a target?

FORD: These particular recommendations I think have to be related to what our military advisers - the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Westmoreland and others - have recommended as to what is the particular target or targets that ought to be attacked. But





overall I would say we ought to raise the question whether or not we have as effectively as possible used our military power where we have an overwhelming superiority.

QUESTION: Are you suggesting a sea blockade for one thing - or are you ~~suggesting~~ suggesting Nationalist Chinese troops might be brought in as an Allied force, or what do you mean by "maximizing" Allied support?

FORD: I think it's a question that ought to be very significantly considered whether or not we should bring in the Chinese Nationalist forces, South Korean forces, Philippine forces... so they can make a contribution against Communist aggression in all of Southeast Asia.

QUESTION: I would like to ask Senator Dirksen if he welcomes the impending visit of the Commonwealth Group to Washington and other capitals.

DIRKSEN: Well, I have no objection at all to receiving any responsible group coming from sovereign powers and manifesting their interest in a peace in Southeast Asia. However, finally you're going to have to get back to Hanoi, because that is the government in question that is causing the real difficulty. It may be implemented, of course, with weapons from China and from the Soviet Union, but we have to pin the label of aggression on North Vietnam, and I tried to make clear here in the statement that we are ready for negotiation with responsible representatives of responsible



sovereign powers.

Now there's been a hint, of course, that these National Liberation Front might sit in... well, the National Liberation Front represents no country, it is not a sovereign power, and the very idea ought to be repudiated.

There's been discussion in some quarters that Viet Cong ought to sit at the negotiation table. It represents no government and it represents no sovereign power, and as a result you can't deal with people like that who have in mind finally communiting all of Vietnam if they can bring it about.

QUESTION: (Inaudible)

DIRKSEN: Oh, no, I have no question about it at all, because those are responsible people and they ARE sovereign powers.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, do you feel that some sort of concession must first come from Hanoi?

DIRKSEN: Well, I think it's got to be initiated by Hanoi. But they have very steadfastly disdained any interest in what the President said when he used the term in the Baltimore speech... about these discussions, unconditional discussions. We've had no reaction from Hanoi whatsoever, and obviously they being the aggressors, we have no choice except to keep up the pressure and carry out the commitment with respect to the freedom and the independence and the defense of South Vietnam.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, Congressman Ford says he supports the policy of no large-scale ground force there on the part of the

U.S. - do you subscribe to that?

DIRKSEN: Well, I don't believe that is exactly what he said. I think... I think it's a matter that should be discussed and that has always been my opinion. I've said over and over again in providing support for the President in his policies, that we ask always to be consulted, to have a chance to suggest alternatives, and other methods... when the die is cast. Then you have no choice except to go along unless you want to exhibit to the world that you've got a disunited country - and that's the last thing we dare do under these circumstances, because that's the very burden of the propaganda that comes short-wave out of Peiping and also out of Hanoi.

I had one of the monitored sheets on one of those broadcasts delivered only 3 weeks ago - the names of a good many Senators were mentioned. Their quoted remarks were in this broadcast. And it's the kind of stuff with which they're trying to drench the soldiers over there at the present time - shake the morale of our people - and the morale of the Vietnamese as well - and then boost the morale of the Viet Cong by saying: Stay in there and pitch... it's only going to be a little while before we shall capitulate.

QUESTION: On another matter, what do you gentlemen think of the organization sponsored by Senator Goldwater... (Note: rest of question not clear.)

DIRKSEN: Well, in the first place, I do not know quite what is envisioned by a "Free" Society... in fact, I'm not so sure.



that I know what is envisioned by the "Great Society" - let alone the "Great Free Society"... so until I get a fill-in, I'm afraid I can't give you a responsive answer. (LAUGHTER)

QUESTION: (Inaudible)

DIRKSEN: I haven't heard. I have to rely entirely upon you gentlemen and your dispatches to keep me informed as to the direction of the wind.

QUESTION: (Inaudible)

FORD: If this organization is harmful or detrimental to the regular Republican organization, I would raise some questions about it. I'm told that it doesn't in any way whatsoever have the aim or objective of a third party and they tell us that it can be helpful in trying to educate people along certain economic and domestic lines. If that's the purpose and if it's carried out, I see no harm or detriment to the organization.

DIRKSEN: I would add only one thought about it and that is obviously any kind of an organization that is set up has to have some money. I've said over and over again that in the political business there is no substitute for money. (LAUGHTER) And if their goals are high, obviously that takes from your regular established Republican organization - established in every state, in every county, and in every precinct - so that I want to be sure always that when the party and its troops goes into battle in November of 1966 that there will be an adequate supply of funds to sustain us in what we hope will be a victory from top to bottom.



QUESTION: Senator Watson was elected as a Goldwater Republican... (Note: rest of question not clear.)

DIRKSEN: Well, I have not seen the South Carolina ballot, but I'm pretty sure that they carried the legends "Republican" and "Democrat." I'm pretty certain that they didn't tag Mr. Watson as a Goldwater Republican on the ballot, so I have to feel that he ran as a Republican. Now obviously it had 1964 overtones - that may be sure - but he ran as a Republican and got 70% of the vote - and I thought that that was quite impressive.

Now you speak of a Federal-Election-Control-Bill. I'm not sure I know what measure you are referring to.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: Well, you mean the bill with which we have been working here... you say that will dry up the Republican Party...

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: I've heard no such claims and having been immersed in the thing up to my ears for so long, I put no stock in it.

QUESTION: (Inaudible)

FORD: One of our members - Congressman Callway from Georgia - went to Saigon, spent four or five days there, just returned - at his own expense. He is a graduate of West Point, he came back with some very keen observations, and I think that such a mission on his part was a constructive effort in this current problem.



DIRKSEN: I think it ought to be pointed out that if perchance a Congressman or a Senator goes to Vietnam - there are other things besides the military, I'm sure, that might be assessed. You've got an economic problem, you've got a political problem, there is the question of stability, and a great many other facets of the economic life of the country that anyone can take a look at. You can also appraise, for instance, what progress they're making in agriculture and whether they're keeping up with rice production - notwithstanding the number of young Vietnamese that no doubt are being drafted into the Army. So there are a lot of things that can be surveyed and I see no harm in it - provided, of course, they don't undertake to give direction to the military effort as against the judgment of people who for a lifetime have been schooled in the whole area of tactics and strategy and military operations.



*Please return  
Dunst*

THE JOINT SENATE-HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP

SENATOR DIRKSEN - REPRESENTATIVE FORD

July 15, 1965

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, ladies and gentlemen, are you all prepared... and we have your assurance, I take it, that there's film in that camera - and I trust there will be.

... statement with respect to the passing of Adlai Stevenson. His transition comes as a shock and as an irreparable loss to the Republic. He had high talent, and I regarded him certainly as a man of brilliance and a man of great attainment. It was not particularly the offices he held, such as the Governorship of Illinois or the Ambassadorship to the United Nations, but rather the fact he was a man of courage, he was an amiable, affable person, not at all brittle as some would think of him... he had a great appeal to young Americans and he had a great fidelity to his ideals and a conviction to fight through to them.

I think Adlai Stevenson will be regarded as one of the great men of our times. And speaking for the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, we certainly mourn his passing and we take this manner of extending sympathy to the family.

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



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

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

On the minority side, it imposes an obligation to avoid carping about trivia. The minority should avoid the hypocrisy of complaining about measures which it would favor if it were in a position of policy maker. No administration should be blamed for events beyond its control.

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

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





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

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

We pray that the national security decisions of the President may always be wise. If we must agree (Note: Senator Dirksen says "agree" here - not "disagree")... with any of those decisions, we shall never question his sincere desire for peace. We expect that responsible spokesmen for HIS party will credit us with similar motives.



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

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

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

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

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

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

Any doubt as to the resoluteness of the United States in the pursuit of the objective of maintaining the freedom and independence



of South Vietnam that has arisen is due to unfortunate statements of some Democrats.

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

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



QUESTION: (Inaudible)

FORD: The establishment of a coalition government -

QUESTION: (Interrupts - inaudible)

FORD: I think if the President agreed to an agreement that included those provisions, it would be a meaningless agreement.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

FORD: Well, I think the conditions that we have set forth here are reasonable under the circumstances and would certainly fall within the definition of the President's definition of a meaningless agreement, so we - as I interpret his words and our conditions - we stand alike. I can't imagine the President making any such agreement that would violate either of these two provisions.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

FORD AND DIRKSEN: Yes.

QUESTION: Is there any inconsistency between the two statements?

DIRKSEN: I see none.

FORD: I don't see any.

QUESTION: Well, Senator, are you satisfied that the recent criticisms by Mr. Ford and Mr. Laird fall within the framework of bipartisanship that you describe?

DIRKSEN: Well, now, you'll have to particularize the statements and the criticism that has been made thus far. If you've got something specific in mind, I can give you a specific answer.



QUESTION: There has been a suggestion by Mr. Laird, for instance, that under certain conditions the Republican support might be withdrawn.

DIRKSEN: Well, I talked with Mr. Laird about that and I don't believe he said it in quite that fashion, nor did it have quite that meaning. And we would be the last if, first, we are consulted - given a chance to participate in decisions - and be consulted - and then the decision is made - to do anything to project to the world a kind of disunity between the parties over here. It's the LAST THING we would do.

QUESTION: Mr. Ford, would you explain what you had in mind in the 4th paragraph here where you say "the minority should avoid the hypocrisy of complaining about measures which it would favor if it were in the position of policy maker." Do you have anything in mind? (Note: the questioner obviously means "Mr. Dirksen" - as he is quoting from his statement.)

DIRKSEN: Not particularly, John. We just want to keep this at a high level and I think you'll agree that generally speaking we have done so.

QUESTION: Mr. Ford, you have indicated - and Mr. Laird has indicated - that the present decision to increase the U.S. troop commitments in South Vietnam is a mistake, that you are against that kind of major increase. Does this statement now indicate you have changed your mind and now accept that increase...



FORD: Not at all. We don't set forth the numbers in the statement here.

QUESTION: (Inaudible)

FORD: Yes, I think in the first paragraph of my statement we indicate that the President has agreed to increase the commitment of American ...

QUESTION: (Interrupts - not clear)

FORD: My position would be that if an increase is aimed at protecting our installations and our personnel already there, I would fully and without any hesitation or qualification support the President. But if there is a change in our policy with an increase of our American ground forces, then I would raise questions and would hope that the President would call upon the Republican leaders to make any suggestions we might have.

QUESTION: Would you clarify that change of policy that you have in mind?

FORD: Well, if it's a policy decision by the President - and I have no information to that effect - that would be aimed at getting the United States involved in a large-scale, ground war... then I would have to raise some questions at that time...whether we would support him or not would be predicated upon the circumstances and the conditions that existed at that particular time.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, would you support the President if we were to use increased troop commitment ... to support the United States in a large-scale, ground war?



DIRKSEN: Well, you have to put it in this frame. They have been so careful about avoiding that word "war" or that we are at war over there. Now, you can cut it as thick or as thin as you like, but we are in conflict ~~with~~ whether we like it or not.

Now, we went there to help the Vietnamese. Our job was to be advisers over there. Now it's quite clear from the dispatches that our own troops are in combat at the present time - that IS something of a change in policy. And all we say is under those circumstances we ought to be consulted as to precisely what the objectives will be, what the consequences might be, how far they're going to go, and I think what happened yesterday and the day before is a rather classic example - the allegation that our planes went across the lines of Red China. I don't know whether they did or not, but let's just find out - give us the details - is there going to be, or is there not going to be, any sanctuary... how far are they going to go with these operations - just tell us before these decisions are made - and we're not going to kick up our heels and cause trouble or show a disunited front to the world.

But in every case it's a matter of making that information available.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: Well, from time to time we have. And that's all we ask.

QUESTION: Is the implication here that you haven't been consulted enough?



DIRKSEN: Well, now, it's quite possible that there will be an announced change of policy - and I say that not as of knowledge, that's a pure speculation. But if that's going to be the case, very well, let's have a meeting of the joint leadership with the President and with his advisers and let's get a clear idea. For how are we going to tell the people back home exactly where we're going in a conflict costing lives that is 12,000 miles away?

QUESTION: Well, are you suggesting there has been a change of policy about which you have not been consulted?

DIRKSEN: Oh, no, I haven't, John. I said IF there is a change...

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: I just evaluate the facts and say, well, they're engaged in fighting - they're not advisers.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: Well, I have a personal opinion that there is something of a change.

QUESTION: Well, Senator, do you mean if there is a determination to commit large additional U.S. forces to a ground war that the Republicans should be consulted?

DIRKSEN: Certainly so! We're expected to supply the money, we're expected to supply the equipment and materiel, and everything else that you need, to fight an action of that kind. Why SHOULDN'T we be advised? That's not something that you just pour across a committee table behind closed doors for a limited number of people in



the House and in the Senate.

QUESTION: Well, Senator, when you tell the American people exactly what you're going to do, don't you also tell the enemy what you're going to do?

DIRKSEN: Well, I think we have been rather carefully guarded in that matter.

QUESTION: (Interrupts) ... (Note: first part of question not clear) ... you said the American people ought to be told. How do you tell the American people what we're going to do without telling the enemy?

DIRKSEN: Haven't we done it pretty well within a broad frame? Without ever conveying any military secrets?

QUESTION: (Asks something about a settlement.)

FORD: Well, as long as that agreement resulted in South Vietnam being free from aggression from the North, or internal subversion generated from the North, that type of a settlement, I think, would be satisfactory. But one of the mandatory provisions would be that the Viet Cong both externally and internally would abide by the independence of South Vietnam.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: That has not been discussed with us.

QUESTION: Do you think that's something ought to be discussed with you?

DIRKSEN: Well, when you call out reserves in large numbers, it's going to require money and there's going to have to be



a procurement program. I think we should be consulted and I anticipate that we probably will be.

QUESTION: (Note - two reporters talk at same time)

DIRKSEN: Wait a minute - one at a time.

QUESTION: Do you have a position - as of now - on calling up reserves?

DIRKSEN: No, and for a very good reason. That is in the field of military judgment and what they may require. I don't know what Westmoreland (?) requires over there. He may make a very good case for "X" number or "Y" number... but the case has to be made and justified, so it's a military judgment... and we try very carefully to avoid making any military judgments up here lest there be some impression that we're trying to run the war, and that's the very LAST THING that we would -

QUESTION: (Interrupts) (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: Yes, I think the President has a very considerable latitude in that field under existing law.

QUESTION: Mr. Ford, do you subscribe to Senator Dirksen's unwillingness to be critical of the military judgment at the present time?

FORD: I haven't been critical of the President's military judgment... I think the Republicans have a right under a true bipartisan policy in this critical period to make suggestions from time to time. And this has been done in the past when Senator Johnson was in the Senate in 1954 when he was very critical and made some suggestions at the time of Dien Bien Phu... this was done by the late



Senator Arthur Vandenberg in 1946 or '47 at the time of Yalta... in other words, we can't be silenced, we can't give a complete and total blank check in perpetuity. The Republicans have an obligation to ask questions, to make suggestions, and if we do that, if we're accorded that privilege, then I think we can stand shoulder to shoulder with the President.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen indicates that he would exclude military judgment ... from criticism. (Note: this is the gist of what the question is - not the complete question.)

FORD: I think you have to take the Senator's comment in the context of the question which was asked. The question was: whether we need reservists called up. This is a purely military question as to whether or not we have enough men on active duty to protect our position militarily. This is purely a military question.

QUESTION: (Two reporters speak at once.)

DIRKSEN: One at a time... (LAUGHS) Who's talking?

QUESTION: Wouldn't that also be a military decision - whether to bomb the missile bases... (Note: rest of question not clear.)

FORD: I think this is a mixture of a military policy and a policy that involves, perhaps, the State Department. I have consistently said we should intensify our air strikes in North Vietnam against significant military targets. I believe that the 5 or 6 SAM-sites in North Vietnam are significant military targets. Now when the President gets a recommendation like that, or for any target from the Pentagon, he weighs that recommendation with the recommendations



from the Department of State - those decisions are more than purely military determinations. And my recommendation is in the same light of the same context.

QUESTION: Mr. Ford, do you personally feel we should call up reserves at a time when you obviously feel we're not making maximum use of our air and sea power?

FORD: In this area I would rely on the judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They can tell us whether under the current military circumstances - or the foreseeable conditions - whether or not they need additional Army, Navy, or Air Force reservists called up for active duty.

QUESTION: (Asks about settlement... how do you reach a situation where the Communists will be willing to negotiate and accept a settlement involving a coalition government.)

FORD: The Administration's policy at the present time is aimed at making it so costly for the Viet Cong by our air attacks and by our operations on the sea that they will stop or cease their ground activity in South Vietnam. It seems to me that basically this is good policy, but I do raise the question whether we have adequately intensified our air attacks against significant military targets in North Vietnam and whether we have fully utilized the potential of our Navy in preventing, for example, the flow of military supplies into the ports of North Vietnam.

QUESTION: Do you think that through air attacks and use of sea power that we can get them to the conference table?



FORD: Well, the Administration at the present time is apparently following that policy. I think this is the basis upon which they are carrying on our actions in South and North Vietnam.

DIRKSEN: Well, let me... After all, ~~frankly speaking~~ I felt MacArthur was pretty right when he said "There is no substitute for victory." And secondly, if you want a classic example of how you can mess up a conference, just remember that we sent Averell Harriman out to Laos and look what we got as a bargain. That one you can interpret for yourself.

QUESTION: Senator, who were you quoting when you said "There is no substitute for victory."

DIRKSEN: MacArthur.

QUESTION: (Two reporters speak at once.)

DIRKSEN: Well, wait a minute, let's have one -

QUESTION: (Again they speak at same time.)

DIRKSEN: Wait a minute, Richard. (LAUGHTER) Open the door, Richard. (LAUGHTER)

QUESTION: Senator, do you agree with Representative Ford that we should be stepping up our air raids in North Vietnam?

DIRKSEN: Well, if there's a necessity for it, a military necessity, yes. Now... there can be a variety of reasons for it. I caught a reason from a young fellow who was in my office late last week. He's been over there for a year. I said I understand those B-52 attacks weren't very effective. Well, he said, maybe not in one



respect, but you'd be surprised what those big boys coming over did for the morale - not only for the American troops, but of the Vietnamese troops as well.

So you might not have had a shattering of all of these underground passage-ways, but you had a very distinctive psychological effect.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen -

DIRKSEN: Yes, Richard. (LAUGHTER)

QUESTION: Do you find any fault whatsoever with the way President Johnson has conducted the war up to now?

DIRKSEN: I don't believe I have, as a matter of fact. And I don't.... well, let me amplify. And we have to assume, of course, that every hour on the hour - if that's the way it is - CIA gives him a report, the Joint Chiefs give him a report... there's constant communication between Saigon and Washington. The President knows what's going on, he certainly MUST, and they're having these constant conferences here, so surely whatever decisions are made, whatever actions are taken, are based upon the facts from hour to hour and day to day. And I just have to assume that the Commander-in-Chief is acting with the advice of the best advisers he can find. And we didn't train these people on the Joint Chiefs in vain for a period of 30 or 40 years... if they don't know, then I ask you, Richard, how should a humble shavetail - who served in World War I - have the answer to a military question.

QUESTION: May I ask Mr. Ford to address himself to this same question.



FORD: I strongly support the President's actions in meeting Communist aggression in South Vietnam. I do raise some questions and have made some suggestions for intensification of the air superiority that we have against significant military targets in North Vietnam - and I also believe we can more effectively utilize our sea power in the same area. But basically I fully agree with the President's firmness against Communist aggression in that area.

QUESTION: You have talked about the possibility of the changing nature of the war. What troop level... (Note: rest of question not clear.)

FORD: Ray, I would ~~know~~ <sup>hesitate</sup> to pick a figure. I think it's a basic question of whether or not there has been a policy decision to do more than use our ground forces primarily for the protection of personnel... (Note: not clear at this point)... there - and the protection of our bases.

The other policy would be movement and commitment of substantial numbers of U.S. forces on the ground for the purpose of changing the nature of the war. As far as I know as of the moment, there has been no decision in that regard.

QUESTION: Are you opposed to such a decision?

FORD: As Senator Dirksen said a few moments ago, if there is to be a change from the present policy to a large-scale, ground warfare commitment, the President ought to have a Joint Meeting of the Republican and Democratic legislative leaders so that



all the facts can be laid out on the table as to the need and as to the necessity - until that is done, I can make no commitment one way or another. The circumstances could change tomorrow. There are circumstances that get beyond our control - beyond the control of the President - but I DO raise the question that we ought to be cautious in this regard before making any basic change or decision.

QUESTION: (Inaudible)

FORD: If there are any such changes, I for one have not been consulted.

QUESTION: (Inaudible - bells ringing)

DIRKSEN: .... except we are not on the Commission. The Commission consists of an Indian, a Canadian, and a Pole (?). And that's just exactly what's wrong... with that Commission that is headquartered in Cambodia.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: No, the one that was negotiated subsequently... that inter-allied commission they have over there came almost immediately out of the Geneva Pact of 1954.

QUESTION: (Asks a question about Averell Harriman.)

DIRKSEN: Oh, well, Averell Harriman is a friend of mine.  
(LAUGHTER) (EVERYBODY TALKS AT ONCE)

QUESTION: (Says something about Geneva Pact of 1954...)

DIRKSEN: Frankly, I think he was. And they approached it with a "Hi-He." But of course it came a ....

Let me make one suggestion here. I had a retired General in the other day. He says the thing to do out there is to wheel out



of mothballs these other battleships we've got - ~~they~~ that will throw a thousand-pound shell a matter of 20 miles - and put them in the China Sea and the Tonkin Bay and you're going to get a range that will really fix 'em.

Now, that's an officer speaking who's wedded to one type of war.

I was a wagon-soldier during the war. You ask me? I'd say, well, let's pulverize them with 75-mm... and then let's get up to 155mm howitzer. You ask an Infantry General... he'd say, why you couldn't begin to win a war unless you had the dough boys sloggin' in there - and hold the ground inch by inch as you take it. Well, that was that placement warfare that we went through in World War I.

Now you ask somebody who was in the Air Service... he's say, Oh, that's a lot of stuff. That's just old hat. What you need to do is pound 'em from the air.

So you get many of these decisions depending upon a military point of view - and I suppose it's only because they've been associated with that particular branch of the service.

We're not going to make military decisions for all the branches, because I'm going to get mixed up between missiles and howitzers and small arms and bazookas and all the rest...

QUESTION: Senator, I want to ask you one question. (Points out the difference between what Ford wants and Dirksen wants - militarily.)

DIRKSEN: Well, I don't recommend - or not recommend. If the President thinks that's the thing to do, very well. He's the Commander-in-Chief. If on the basis of the information available to him - that is NOT available to us - who am I to challenge his judgment?

QUESTION: (Not clear)

FORD: Well, I would expect that if there is a basic change in decision - in policy - that we should be consulted... ahead of time... given an opportunity to make suggestions and recommendations.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: Oh, well, if you put it in this light - we don't expect the President to call us down there morning, noon, and night. After all, these judgments are developed through consultation and when the time comes, I'm pretty confident that he will summon the leadership and say, all right, here it is on the basis of new evidence - perhaps new objectives - and whatever else enters into the picture.

QUESTION: Gerry, you singled out two types of settlement which you say would not be acceptable. Do you have some reason to think that either of those two types of settlement is in the air - or do you think something like this is about to happen?

FORD: I have no evidence that either are imminent, but we feel it's important that these observations be made for the benefit of the President and the benefit of the American people.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: Well, how are we going to bring it to a conclusion if we don't gain a victory. What's the alternative? To

ease out a little at a time - or to pull 'em out at once - or to fight on through - or to put a holding force on the 17th Parallel and say, well, we'll set up some permanent establishments here and we're just going to be here for quite a long time. So bring in the kitchenware and whatever is needed for a long period of housekeeping. Is there any other alternative except to fight it through to a victorious conclusion?

And besides, don't forget for a moment that the prestige and the face of this country is involved in all of Southeast Asia.

What do you think they would think in Malaysia, in Indonesia, in the Philippines, as a matter of fact, or in New Guinea or Australia, or in Burma, about the United States... turned out to be a "paper tiger" after all. What happens then to our prestige? Our line, our present line, runs from Indochina to Korea... you'll then pull your line, your Pacific perimeter in, and it'll be from Alaska to Hawaii - and then WHEN will it be pulled in and be from Alaska to some point in South America - and then you're within shooting distance of San Francisco.

QUESTION: Senator, we have said repeatedly - our government has said repeatedly - any number of times - that we seek a negotiated peace, have been extremely careful not to use the words "total victory" -

DIRKSEN: I didn't say anything about "total victory" - I just say a "victory" and - well, a victory could be the initiative on their part to ask for a truce - and you still don't have a total



victory. But we could consider it a victory. That's why we used the word "truce" as well as "treaty" in this statement. We don't want that mistake to be made because you make a "truce" that's conditional or you've got the wrong people around the table and you'd just as well kiss it goodbye. Because you're on the first rung of the ladder.

QUESTION: Senator, on another subject -

DIRKSEN: First, was that a record vote? You don't even care about missing... (LAUGHTER)

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: You say - are they? I don't know but if they do, I'll be there.

THE JOINT SENATE-HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP

SENATOR DIRKSEN - REPRESENTATIVE FORD

July 22, 1965

STATEMENT BY REP. GERALD R. FORD: Next week the members of the House of Representatives will demonstrate by their votes whether they are members of an independent branch of government or simply yes men responding blindly to the manipulation of the Executive branch of the government.

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

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

If the House is not to sacrifice its self-respect, it will vote down the proposal that shuts its mouth, plugs its ears, closes its eyes and swallows the Johnson's Administration's prescription without adequate debate and without opportunity to vote on important amendments.

The action expected next week is the latest manifestation of a disturbing tendency to avoid discussion of the subject of the



repeal of Section 14(b) on its merits. The Administration has engaged in a cynical type of log-rolling on this important subject. It has sought to convince city Congressmen to vote for a bread tax against their convictions in order to get repeal of Section 14(b) and farm Congressmen to vote for repeal of 14(b) against their convictions in order to get a farm bill.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

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

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

There is universal recognition of the need for reform of the system of representation obtaining in most states at the time of several well-known Supreme Court decisions. In fact, in 1955 a presidential commission reported to President Eisenhower that the strengthening of state governments called for adequate representation of the interest of urban areas in state legislative bodies. I welcome



the reforms now under way in many states in the belief that they provide more equitable representation and help to invigorate state governments. I do ~~not~~ NOT on the other hand, conclude that mechanical adherence to the "one man, one vote" principle should be imposed on both branches of the legislature in every state by Federal fiat regardless of the ~~desires~~ desires of the people. Everyone concedes that it is appropriate to require that representation in one house of the legislature of each state be based solely on the factor of population.

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

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

Experience shows that the "one man, one vote" principle can be used to euvre minorities out of seats in legislative bodies. This can be accomplished by submerging minorities in large constituencies with at-large elections, as has been done in the State of Virginia to render less likely the election of members of minority groups to the State legislature. It can be accomplished by drawing district lines so as to spread the minority population thinly over a number of districts.

The issue which the proposed amendment presents is/this: <sup>simply</sup>

Shall we allow the people to make the decision about the basis of representation in one house of their legislature, or shall we impose a decision on them whether they want it or not?

We propose to fight this... MEET this issue... and fight every step of the way to preserve our Federal-State system and the historic right of the people of the several states to determine the composition of one branch of their own legislature according to their desires.





QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: Tony, I never abandoned any hope.

QUESTION: (Asks something about Senator Javits and the amendment.)

DIRKSEN: I do not quite know what you mean by the word "whammy." Now if you tell me what you mean... (Voice says: "How do you spell it?")

DIRKSEN: Well... maybe my friend isn't - what shall I say - an etymological (?) scholar... and probably he knows how to spell "whammy."

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: Well, I had a little visit with Senator Javits yesterday and I think we understand each other quite well. And as you well know, I've long followed a principle that there is no insurmountable obstacle in this world and who knows - what will happen?

QUESTION: How do you propose to surmount this obstacle?

DIRKSEN: Oh... I don't want to telegraph my punch right now. I prefer to wait until that time comes.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: Well, who knows? It would be on the floor of the Senate or in the Senate Judiciary Committee - one of the two.

QUESTION: Senator, do you think it would be necessary or inadvisable to keep the Congress in session - past Labor Day - in view of the Vietnam situation?

DIRKSEN: That I cannot say. I can say this, I believe: that, first, it's generally conceded that that situation has been



deteriorated. If that were not so, there would be no occasion to send additional contingents of troops into Vietnam.

Secondly, you're confronted with the problem of Presidential authority, or authority in the Commander in Chief, to determine what should be done - that's his problem under the circumstances, and that involves many things. Does it require more troops? Does it require additional authority? Does he need additional money?

Now as I understand the existing law, the President can declare an emergency and under that declaration he is presently empowered to call up as many as a million reserves.

Now, what he wants to do beyond that remains to be seen.

QUESTION: Would you like to see the passage of a Congressional declaration of emergency before calling up reserves?

DIRKSEN: Well, I do not pass upon that matter now, largely because it would be too difficult to measure its impact. We had a discussion of this whole matter in the Joint Leadership this morning and Congressman Ford has taken a particularly active interest in this matter and he may want to say a word on this with respect to the number of reserves that were called up in the Eisenhower Administration as distinguished from any other Administration.

So I invite Gerry now to say a word about that, if he likes.

FORD: It seems to me that the burden of proof on whether reserves should be called up, whether enlistments should be extended, and whether there should be increased draft calls, should be placed squarely on the Secretary of Defense and the Administration.



I have in my hand here a pamphlet put out last week by the Defense Department and on the last page the Secretary of Defense sets forth military strength increases since January 1961. He points out there's been a 45% increase in the number of combat ready divisions. He points out that there's been a 51% increase in the number of Air Force Fighter Squadrons. The Secretary of Defense speaks about a 500% increase in the number of sorties which our fighter aircraft can fly with modern ammunition. The Secretary of Defense says there has been a thousand percent increase in special forces trained for counter-insurgency.

I think we ought to ask the question - in view of all of these improvements in the Department of Defense since January of 1961 - why is it necessary to call up reservists to extend enlistments and to increase the draft?

And I might point out in addition ... in the 8 years of the Eisenhower Administration, we had the crisis in Quemoy and Matsu; we had the crisis in Lebanon; we had a Berlin crisis. And not once in the Eisenhower Administration were any reservists called up to meet these crises. I further point out that since January of 1961 under this Administration there have been 2 cases where reservists have been called up for active duty - in the case of Berlin in 1961... 150,000 reservists were called to active duty... and in the case of the Cuban Missile Crisis, this Administration called up 15,000 reservists to active duty. There must be some explanation why in four and a half years we've already had two call-ups and probably a third, particularly in light



of these proclaimed increases in our military capability.

QUESTION: Congressman Ford, what in your view now should be the policy goals of the Administration in respect to the fighting in Vietnam? In other words, what should the American people be told that they're fighting for?

FORD: I think the American people should be told that they're fighting actually communist aggression in South Vietnam. And if communist aggression prevails in South Vietnam, it will be very likely that similar Communist aggression will be attempted elsewhere throughout the world.

DIRKSEN: But a further answer... Andy, first of all, if as we suspect this situation is rapidly deteriorating, certainly we ought to be told on the basis of the very latest CIA and other intelligence reports precisely what it is and precisely what our military experts think ought to be done. We make no pretense that we're experts, or we deal in the field of policy. But once given that basic information up to the last hour that it's available, I think we could come to the proper conclusions and could state not only more readily but more pointedly what ought to be told to the American people. And we have in mind always that it's their youngsters that are going to be sent out there and some of them not come back. And that's a serious business in anybody's book.

QUESTION: If the reservists are to be called up, should the President ask Congress to authorize it, or should he use the emergency powers that he now has?



FORD: I personally think that the President should ask the Congress for authority - even though he does have some authority at the present time to declare an emergency and to take some action.

QUESTION: Mr. Ford, are you suggesting that you might oppose...

FORD: I didn't say that I was going to oppose, but the burden of proof is on the Secretary of Defense to justify in light of all of the claimed improvements in the Department of Defense since January of 1961.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: Well, there again, as I indicated a moment ago, what is the last word over there? How far HAS THE SITUATION deteriorated? And not the least of the problems is the question of available materiel and equipment.

QUESTION: Are they short of this?

DIRKSEN: Well, are they? You pick these things up in the air and I know that one Senate subcommittee at least is taking a good look at it. It has disclosed nothing as yet - nor have I been so curious as to go about and ask what they've found until they've completed their work. But I know that a search is being made in that field.

QUESTION: Mr. Ford, I just wanted to ask you: Suppose the President calls up the reserves... should he seek authority from Congress?

FORD: The answer is the President ought to request the Congress to approve a call-up of reserves... the President ought to come before the Congress and before the American people, pointing out within the confines of security what the circumstances are. And if he asks the Congress for this authority, it will give the members of the House AND the Senate the opportunity to ask these questions: Why in view of all of these improvements in the Defense Department do we have to have a call-up of reserves for the third time in four and a half years?

QUESTION: Mr. Ford, why do you shrink from the use of ground forces in Vietnam? (Note: rest of question not clear.)

FORD: Not at all - not at all. Because we have an air superiority; we have a naval superiority. If we use this superiority more effectively than we have in the past, it ought to be more convincing to the enemy than engage them in the kind of warfare where they may have (and I underline may have) a superiority.

QUESTION: Didn't we have complete air and naval superiority in Korea in 1950 and yet we retreated 400 miles - lost 9 straight battles - and didn't regain an inch of it until we landed ground troops?

FORD: Yes, but we also stepped up our air activity in North Korea at the same time that the ground forces were shipped in.

DIRKSEN: I ought to amplify a little by simply saying that we do not shrink from doing whatever the situation calls for. But we ought to be informed. We ought to be told exactly what that situation is, and I think within the limits of security that you pointed



out - the American people ought to be alerted to the gravity of this thing, because this is for keeps.

QUESTION: May I get back to 14 (b). How unified will the House Republicans be...

FORD: Well, the first vote will come Monday on the gag rule which is now proposed, and I feel in opposing the gag rule the Republicans will be highly unified. If we can defeat the gag rule, then we can open up the debate and the consideration to amendments which we think are meaningful and constructive. If we can do that, we will be very much more unified than we will be under the gag rule which the Administration is proposing.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

FORD ~~KOENIGS~~: It's open to amendment, but the kind of amendments that can be offered are severely restricted by the rule of germaneness... they're strictly limited to the very confining areas proposed in the bill. And we feel an important issue such as this ought to have 6 hours of debate rather than the 2 proposed in the Rule, and we think that the opportunity to offer debate, I mean to offer amendments, should be opened up so that we can really do some meaningful work in trying to improve the situation.

QUESTION: What are the amendments you have in mind?

FORD: Well, there will be a wide variety of amendments. I can think of 4 or 5... Congressman Robert Griffin among others will undoubtedly propose some amendments that will limit the union dues to the economic issues between labor and management. I understand

Congresswoman Edith Green has an amendment that involves conscientious objectors who for reasons of their religious faith don't want to belong in a compulsory way to a labor organization.

There are a number of other amendments - I only mention two.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

FORD: Well, it's very obvious to anyone who walks around the Office Building on the House side of the Capitol that there are people who want repeal of 14(b) who are going to city congressmen and saying: You have to vote for this omnibus agriculture bill even though it will impose a bread tax in order for us to get agricultural congressmen to vote for Section 14(b) repeal. The mobs are moving around the House Office Building trying to put together this cynical combination.

QUESTION: (Asks something about the White House)

FORD: I'm sure they are very active in trying to put together this combination.

QUESTION: Who are some of the people active in...

FORD: Well, I have a letter here from the Farmers Union, for example, that is urging all Congressmen... I'm certain it's aimed at Congressmen from farm areas... to vote for the repeal of Section 14(b). And some of my labor friends are around talking to city Congressmen urging them to vote for the bread tax in order to achieve the repeal of Section 14(b).

QUESTION: Senator Ford, does that mean the Republican Party is against the farm program?

FORD: We have taken no policy position on it yet in  
the





the House of Representatives.

QUESTION: You're attacking the so-called "bread tax."

FORD: We're attacking this one provision in the omnibus farm bill at this point.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

FORD: Well, I don't want to mention them by name, but if you wander around the House Office Building it's very obvious who they are.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

FORD: I think it's very fair to say that the House Committee on Rules this year has brought forth rules on every controversial proposal that the Administration has requested action. They've brought out the Voting Rights Bill with no problem; they've brought out the Education Bill promptly. There isn't a single instance this year where the House Rules Committee has blocked the consideration of controversial legislation, and I'm certain this year that the Rules Committee would have brought out a rule on Section 14(b) - and if they had, they would have given adequate time for debate, they would have drafted the rule so that meaningful, constructive amendments could be offered, but this gag rule proposal is so restrictive as to time for debate and for the kind of amendment that it ought to be defeated.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

FORD: I'm confident that the Rules Committee would have brought out a rule, but the Administration obviously wanted to try the



21-day-rule... and the first instance we've had the 21-day-rule application, we have a gag rule. I think it's somewhat paradoxical that this is the first development.

QUESTION: Congressman in any event, if it comes to a showdown and we're not able to amend a proposition (?)... would you vote for repeal of the 14(b) clause?

FORD: I personally have long been opposed to the repeal of Section 14(b). I feel that each state ought to have the right, the opportunity, to make the decision itself on this controversial issue.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

FORD: We're in the process now, Sam, of taking a whip check.

QUESTION: Well, you said ... unified earlier.

FORD: I'm sure it will be but to answer the specifics, I can't give you an answer to that.

QUESTION: Mr. Ford, in talking about Secretary McNamara, are you suggesting that he has weakened the Defense Department rather than strengthened it?

FORD: No, I simply took his own figures, which indicate that he's made all of these improvements in the last four and a half years. Now if this is true, why do they have to extend enlistments, call up reservists, and increase the draft calls? The questions ought to be asked. These are substantial improvements... they had probably \$40 to \$50 billion in increased appropriations in the last four and a half years in the Department of Defense. In light of all of these

improvements, additional money, they certainly ought to be asked - and they ought to assume the burden of proof - to justify this call-up of reserves.

QUESTION: Does Senator Dirksen share your view that President Johnson ought to come to Congress before calling up reservists?

FORD: I hesitate to speak for him. I suspect that he does, but I would rather not answer the question directly on his behalf.



THE JOINT SENATE-HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP

SENATOR DIRKSEN

August 5, 1965

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Ladies and gentlemen, if they have film in those cameras and you've got ink in your fountain pens, we'd better get started.

You know, the cost of living is always a significant issue because it strikes every man, woman, and child in the country.

Now the most recent figures on the cost of living convey a rather disheartening bit of news. For the third month in a row a substantial increase in living costs is registered. The increase to date in 1965 has been four times the increase during the same period in 1964.

In the month of June it showed the biggest increase in 23 months. Food prices alone rose 2%. The meat, poultry, and fish group were up 10% from last year.

Food store prices in the Washington area bring these statistics to life. For instance, in one chain store since June of 1964 the cost of smoked ham has risen from 43 cents per pound to 59 cents per pound. At another chain store, the past thirteen months have seen a rise in the cost of rib steaks of 22 cents a pound, while boneless chuck roast has zoomed from 49 cents per pound to 85 cents per pound. Pork chops, succulent pork chops and incidentally my



favorite food, have nearly doubled in price - from 69 cents per pound in June of '64 to today's price of \$1.19 cents. The same store in the same period has seen bacon more than doubled in price, from 49 cents to \$1.05 cents per pound.

There are signs of continued pressure affecting not only the price of food but also a broad range of commodities and services. Wholesale prices, following a six-year period of stability, have risen 2 per cent in the past year. And on top of this, the Labor Department reports that in the first six months of this year the increases granted in wage settlements have averaged 4 per cent - well above the Administration's guideline of 3 1/2 per cent. And that will tend to push prices up even more.

Now in spite of these disquieting signs, the press reports that "Administration spokesmen said they were not worried by the recent surge of consumer prices." These sentiments are certainly not shared by the American housewife, or the wage earner with a family, or the poor, or the retired, or the people who are in the fixed income groups. Perhaps the President should be reminded of that portion of the State of the Union Message in which he said, "Our continued prosperity demands continued price stability."

This inflationary trend effects the billions being expended on the highly publicized war on poverty.



STATEMENT BY REP. GERALD R. FORD: It is now more than four years since the Council of Economic Advisers set an unemployment level of 4 per cent as the "interim goal" of the Administration. It is now more than three years since Hubert Humphrey declared and I quote, "I predict that by the end of the coming calendar year - by December 31, 1962 - the problem of unemployment in the United States will be a page in the history book." The year 1962 is long gone. It has been a long interim, and the achievement of the goal is not yet in sight. The unemployment rate has stuck around the 5 per cent level since early in 1964.

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

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

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

Employment of youth promises to be a more difficult problem within the next few years because of the substantial increases in the



number entering the labor force. In 1964, 2,700,000 Americans reached their 18th birthday. This year 3,700,000 will reach the age of 18, and on through the 1970's approximately 4,000,000 will attain that age each year.

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

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

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



QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, over the last year many Senators - Republicans and some Democrats - complained about low cattle prices - beef and also lamb. Has any of this price increase been finding its way into the pockets of those people?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, since the figures indicate there's been an increase in food prices, one would have to assume that it includes meat, and I think I mentioned there the meat, poultry, and fish group - so there has been an increase there.

QUESTION: Is it going to the cattle raisers?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I have not spelled it out that far. I see these charts, but the charts can either be purposeful or they can be meaningless - it depends on who makes them and whether all factors are taken into account.

I want to add something to what Congressman Ford just said... about this unemployment matter.

It's rather interesting that the Administration does not break down its figures and give the people of the country a real picture of what this unemployment situation is like.

Now, if they'll bother to analyze it a little, they'll find that the heads of households - very stable people - you can get an unemployment rate as low as 2.3 per cent. But it's when you get into the youth groups that it jumps up to 15%, 16% and 17%... and THERE is a real problem.

Now, part of that is due to lack of training and at the time we considered the overall tax bill, they were toying with the





idea of double-time for overtime - meaning thereought to be a shop committee on which there was representation from labor, management AND the government - to evaluate jobs and see whether or not they would have to pay double-time for overtime because maybe people were available for those jobs.

We had testimony on the other side to indicate it would cost management more to train new people than it took to pay time and a half - and there's your real difficulty in the unemployment picture.

Now as you get more youngsters in the country, this is going to become more aggravating.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, I'd like to ask a question on another matter. What are you going to do about re-apportionment now?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I thought I indicated in various statements on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere that when I fight on the basis of principle I fight for keeps. And one heat doesn't constitute the winner of a race. So this was just the first heat.

Now I propose to do exactly what I've done before. If there is an appropriate vehicle to which I can append this proposal that I've submitted, frankly, I intend to do it. And I don't believe there should be any hiatus in the matter.

QUESTION: Have you decided yet which vehicle will be appropriate -

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Not definitely - nor do I want to announce it so far in advance when I do. But I see a vehicle in the



offing... and I do have my eye on it and I'm giving it ample consideration.

QUESTION: 14(b)...

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, Richard... (LAUGHTER)... if this were in a court room I'd have to ask the judge to sustain my objection on the ground that that's a leading question. (EVERYONE TALKS AT ONCE) What did you say?

QUESTION: Where do you expect to get the extra votes? You had 57... you need something like 7 more...

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I must say that you represent the press media - all of whom are most generous with their headlines... because it's beginning to energize the country and I believe they're beginning to understand what the focal issue really is. And they will communicate their sentiments, of course, to their public servants - meaning us.

REP. FORD: It's my understanding, Senator, that the Chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary suspended hearings on this proposed amendment this morning in the House Committee on the Judiciary. Congressman Bill McCulloch - and I subscribe to his decision - has violently objected. Because he and I both feel this matter should be brought from the Committee on the Judiciary in the House and brought to the floor of the House as it was to the Senate for favorable action.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I hope you'll tell the distinguished Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee for me that I think his



action is rather premature. And you might add that it's rather anticipatory.

QUESTION: Congressman Ford, do you have anything to add on the statement who said what to whom at the White House...

REP. FORD: Well... (LAUGHTER)

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Now hold on to your hats... (LAUGHTER)

REP. FORD: Frankly, I do, Bill. And I will read an unsolicited letter which was received this morning from one of you in the news media and I'll let the letter speak for itself. Its address "Golden Winds Cottage, Newfound Lake, Bristol, New Hampshire, August 3, 1965...

"Rep. Gerald Ford  
U. S. Capitol  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Gerry:

I have learned belatedly, here in the distant reaches of New Hampshire, of the President's wholly unfair criticism - presumably of you - of an alleged violation of confidence concerning the alleged contents and influence of Senator Mansfield's statement, read at the White House briefing on Vietnam.

I was one of your guests at the background luncheon. It was I who asked about the Mansfield statement. I said I had learned that Senator Mansfield had read a two-page statement critical of Vietnam at the White House meeting and asked you for the details. Your only comment, as I recall it, was that the statement seemed to you to be longer than two pages. Beyond this statement and your remark that you noticed Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge sitting silently nearby, you vouchsafed no details of Mansfield's statement.

You said nothing... and I repeat nothing... to the effect that Senator Mansfield argued against calling up the reserves or that this had any influence on the President's decision.



I was struck at the luncheon by your great sense of national responsibility when you told us that though you had advocated a different course in Vietnam from the President's, you were going to support our Commander-in-Chief in the decisions that he had made.

The President has been ill-informed - perhaps by inaccurate or tendentious reporting by some newsmen. Please feel free to make this letter public or to send a copy to the President.

Sincerely,

(s) Sam

Samuel Shaffer"

May I add one other comment which I also think will speak for itself:

"The President  
The White House

Dear Mr. President:

The enclosed unsolicited letter was received in my office this morning from a mutual friend, Mr. Sam Shaffer. With his approval I am forwarding this letter to you and making it public.

In light of the events of the past week, if you were referring to me, I must respectfully request a conference with you to determine on what basis you were erroneously informed as to my views.

Warmest personal regards.

Sincerely,

(s) Gerald R. Ford



And may I anticipate one question which I expect will be asked:

If I am invited to the White House as the Republican leader of the House - for any other White House conference on Vietnam or otherwise - of course I will accept. Because this problem in Vietnam is an American problem and the Republican Party and I will do our utmost to help solve it.

But may I add this footnote:

Attendance at any White House meeting of that sort will not prevent me from making constructive suggestions or recommendations or criticisms when I think the policy decisions are wrong. Attendance at a White House conference does not muffle the loyal opposition. It will not silence it if we feel that for the good of America a different course of action must be taken.

QUESTION: (Inaudible)

REP. FORD: The letter was delivered to the White House approximately at 1:30 this afternoon. (Everybody talks at once.)

SENATOR DIRKSEN: You all know Sam Shaffer, don't you?

QUESTION: ... on the House Minority Leader - and then pays courtesy calls on the Senate Minority Leader.

REP. FORD: You'll have to ask the President for his comment on that.

QUESTION: (Inaudible)

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Are you speaking of the courtesy call? Could you perchance be speaking about an impromptu - rather unexpected



visit - to my office by the President last night? Well, all I can say is: the dog came in first and then came the .... (DROWNED OUT BY LAUGHTER)

Now whether the dog came in just as a security measure, I don't know. (LAUGHTER) But in any event, we were in my office - the Majority Leader was there - he was talking to the President - he put me on the line and I talked to the President... and he indicated that if we stayed a little while he might drop in for a visit. And he did, indeed, and he was there within 15 minutes after we were talking on the phone. It was a little like old times - when we used to sit either in his office or in my office and discuss the affairs of the day. Now and then we'd examine a clipping together and... he just sort of added a little tone to the day. So it was QUITE unexpected... I think he was there roughly about an hour... so not having had so much as lunch (as I described on the Senate Floor)... I was getting hungry about that time and finally got some dinner about 11 o'clock last night.

Now you are all clustered around the door. I have a question: How did you find out that he was in the \_\_\_\_\_? Because it wasn't until a little bit 'til you even had the cameras set up. So... somebody must have seen him come. I'm sure my wire wasn't tapped - with the other end up in the Press Gallery. So... (LAUGHS A LITTLE)... I get curious. Tony, maybe you could resolve my curiosity.

TONY: I had gone home -

SENATOR DIRKSEN: You had gone home.



QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, as an astute political observer, do you detect any White House attempt to divide the Senate and House Republican leadership?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Oh, definitely not... nor could it be done. Our fidelity to the Party and to the Party principles and purposes is such and cemented by unabiding friendship... that that could not be brought about under any circumstances. And I salute my friend Garry Ford... for his courage and the devotion he has to the business of the Party and the business of the country, which comes foremost.

QUESTION: (Inaudible)

SENATOR DIRKSEN: No, indeed I don't. I've been asked about it. I said I had no comment. I didn't know because no names were mentioned and I couldn't tell who might be the target of these observations. So under the circumstances I was in no position to make a comment.

QUESTION: (Inaudible)

REP. FORD: I said my attendance at a White House conference... would not preclude me from making constructive suggestions, or recommendations, or, on the other hand, would not preclude me from being critical if I thought the wrong decisions had been made.

QUESTION: (Inaudible)

REP. FORD: Both...

QUESTION: (Not clear)

REP. FORD: I think again you'll have to ask the President about that.



QUESTION: Any indication?

REP. FORD: I've had no communication from the President... other than in the newspapers on Monday.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, were you present at the briefing at which Representative Ford was alleged to have received information... that he later gave out...

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Yes, sir, I was present.

QUESTION: Do you feel he has broken any confidence -

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Who?

QUESTION: Representative Ford.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, you heard Sam Shaffer's letter read which was -

QUESTION: (Inaudible comment)

SENATOR DIRKSEN: No, but it was responsive ... Gerry's answer was responsive to Sam Shaffer's question... and frankly, I have no recollection whatsoever that Gerry made any comment beyond those that were set out in that letter.

QUESTION: Mr. Ford, can we go back to prices? How would the Republicans bring down the prices of these things?

REP. FORD: Well, I would defer to Senator Dirksen who read that statement, but it seems to me that during the Eisenhower Administration we never had any sharp rise of this sort... that robbed the housewife (including my own wife) who tried to buy a few pounds of beef occasionally for the benefit of the Ford family.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, now, the real answer lies in the whole monetary picture. Because if by profligate spending you





begin to fill the bloodstream with money beyond the goods content that we have, obviously you're going to cheapen the dollar and it's going to take more cheaper dollars to buy the same amount of goods. And I share I think with the Governor... Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board... and others... the rather classical definition of how you bring about inflation. And it's a fiscal and a monetary problem - that's where it begins. That's where Britain's inflation begins... and they're having their troubles now. Japan is having its troubles. And we'll have our troubles if we continue to dump this money in untold sums into the economic bloodstream of the country. And besides, I can't help but feel from the results that I've perceived so far that there is a tremendous amount of waste and extravagance <sup>involved</sup> ~~involved~~ - and that only aggravates it.

QUESTION: Senator, did the President yesterday offer to help you on your next go-'round on apportionment?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: He didn't precisely suggest that he was going to help. We did have a little colloquy about it and he said I carried out my promise to you and I didn't interfere. Well, I said, I know but interfering on my side is one thing... interfering on the opposition side is quite another... and I didn't want you to carry it quite that far.

QUESTION: Senator, did you get any kind of offer that he would call Hubert off on the next go-'round?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I didn't even ask him about that. But Hubert had a very healthy smile and a very vigorous laugh... and I



knew he fully appreciated the situation.

QUESTION: (Inaudible)

SENATOR DIRKSEN: No. No, this was when he came into the Chamber. (EVERYBODY TALKS) You saw how bluff and hearty it was.

(LAUGHTER)

THE JOINT SENATE-HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP

SENATOR DIRKSEN - REPRESENTATIVE FORD

September 9, 1965

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, ladies and gentlemen, I presume your pencils are poised, there is film in the camera, and we're prepared to go to work. There is a sign here that says: "Please talk into the mikes." Now - do you hear it back there? You don't? That's good.

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

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

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

Undoubtedly there is room for many improvements in labor's relations with management and management's relations with labor. If the



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

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



STATEMENT BY REP. GERALD R. FORD: The 89th Congress has passed several bills increasing the flow of federal funds available for education. It has added a cut in excise taxes to a reduction of income tax rates in 1964.

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

More than 5 million students will settle on the campuses of colleges and universities throughout the United States this month. In the course of the next 5 years, college enrollment is expected to increase by an additional  $1\frac{1}{2}$  million students.

The average cost of a year of higher education at a public institution is now \$1560; it is \$2370 at a private institution. These costs will continue to rise in future years. It is estimated that tuition charges will increase by 50 per cent in both public and private institutions in the next decade.

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

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



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

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



QUESTION: (About 14(b) - but not clear)

DIRKSEN: Not particularly, Roger, that is to say, I cannot speak with authority as to whether it will or will not. I have to assume that it is part of the President's program and of course I can say this much at least... out of our conversations of several weeks ago, when I raised the question and suggested that 14(b) be thrown overboard, his answer was that he was committed. That's all that was said except I said "WE'RE committed also." And if that's the case, then a struggle will ensue. I said, "Mr. President, I have no secrets. I think we can put at least 25 or more right up on the fighting line at all times in order to keep this thing from coming to a vote - in this session if we have to."

QUESTION: Is there some doubt in your mind as to the strength of this commitment - for the repeal of 14(b)?

DIRKSEN: Well, when the President says he's committed, I have no reason to doubt his statement. Now I can add one thing to it: I picked up a rumour (and it was only a rumour) this morning that perhaps 14(b) might be motioned up before the rest of the Administration program was completed. I think I'm at liberty to say that I discussed it with the Majority Leader this noon and he said the rumour is entirely unfounded, we will go ahead with the program, and 14(b) will come right at the tail end.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: Well, I don't like to dignify rumours by identifying a person or a place. But it came at least from a very responsible member of the Senate. Now where he got it, I don't know. I can only identify

him to this extent and say that he was a member of my party.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: You say -

QUESTION: (Still not clear)

DIRKSEN: Well, my expectation, of course, is founded on conversation no later than 12:30 this noon with the Majority Leader - that it will come along at the tail end of the procession.

QUESTION: (Two reporters talk at once)

DIRKSEN: Bill, I didn't get that entirely -

QUESTION: ... bringing it up last increases the possibility it could be dumped -

DIRKSEN: Well, I would think so. Everybody is aware of the fact that the adjournment contagion is in the air. I don't know how long the House will have to stay here. If I remember my House Rule Book correctly and knowing there's been great pressure for Home Rule for the District of Columbia, it cannot come up until the 27th and Gerry, if I'm correct - at least this is the way it used to work - if it wasn't finished on District Day it had to go over to the next District Day. And in the days when I was Chairman of the House District Committee, we had only two District Days each month - and if you didn't finish on the first day, it went over for at least two weeks. So - if the 27th is the first day and the drive is sustained in order to enact this into law (now that the Senate has passed the Home Rule Bill), then just measure 14 days from the 27th and it does give some substance to these predictions and prophecies that we'll be here until the middle of October. And it could of course be later.





QUESTION: Senator Dirksen -

DIRKSEN: Yes sir, Dick.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: You say - am I the manager?

QUESTION: Yes, sir.

DIRKSEN: Oh, I would think that there would be a manager on both sides of the aisle. In fact, I'm quite sure of it. And carry that a little further - we're going to have a little meeting sometime today by members on both sides of the aisle in order to perfect our so-called management format and get ready for the fray. It will be conducted somewhat like a military operation - we'll have our captains, we'll have our daily monitors, and everybody will be fortified with speeches, and we'll be ready to carry on without any difficulty.

QUESTION: What's your rank, sir? (LAUGHTER)

DIRKSEN: You say "my rank?" Well, Roger, the only rank I ever had was... I started as a Private First Class - later I became a Sergeant at an Artillery School in France - and I was commissioned on the Western Front and became a shavetail, a Second Lieutenant to you.

QUESTION: ... leading the filibuster, is that right? Or one of the leaders of the filibuster?

DIRKSEN: Well, I'll be one of the leaders. Now what rank that gives, I don't know. Of course I might rate 5 stars - who knows?

(LAUGHTER)

QUESTION: Is Senator Russell one of the leaders, too?



DIRKSEN: Well, you know that Senator Russell has not been unduly active during this session and for a very good reason. I was in the hospital at the time he was there and he was just recovering from a tracheotomy - very serious - but we were hospital mates and so we had a chance to confer, to talk, become better acquainted than ever before. And he is husbanding his strength and has not unduly expended his energies and rightly so - until he has completely recovered.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: Oh, yes, but John, I never used the word "filibuster." You notice in this statement I speak something about extended discussion... it's a far nicer phrase.

QUESTION: (Asks something about the Democrat troops.)

DIRKSEN: Oh, I don't want to disclose the number but I can tell you this - about an equal number from both sides.

QUESTION: Senator, you seem to state in your statement here that if 14(b) would come to a vote, you folks would lose (?). What about that?

DIRKSEN: Oh, my dear, I never confess that I'm going to lose. First look at all the brickbats you threw at me on apportionment of state legislatures. I know that you had me as they said in the early days of World War I " " - sunk without a trace. But it's on the Calendar. I told you that word "defeat" and "loss" was chopped out of my dictionary long ago.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: Repeat...



QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: Oh, that's on cloture.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: Well - enough.

QUESTION: To what extent does your statement in this forum commit the Senate and the House Leadership to a filibuster of 14(b)?

DIRKSEN: Oh, but John, we're not committed to a filibuster. We're committed to inform the country. Don't you remember - Thomas Jefferson once said about public responsibility of public officials: "To inform the minds of the people and then abide by their judgment." So what we're trying to do is to inform the country.

QUESTION: (Not clear... asks something about benefits by having it put off until next year.)

DIRKSEN: Yes, but Roger... if you had taken a count of the polls, you will note that sentiment with respect to 14(b) - against its repeal - has been increasing... I won't say by leaps and bounds... but it has been increasing steadily in every poll that I've seen.

QUESTION: (Two reporters speak at once.)

DIRKSEN: Wait a minute - one at a time.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: We don't repudiate labor. You'd be surprised at the number of rank-and-file union people who are in our corner against repeal of 14(b).

QUESTION: (Not clear)



DIRKSEN: Well, you can interpret that in a good many ways. But, you see, the President and I are long-time, close, intimate friends. And I certainly have some notion and some knowledge about his drive, his aggressiveness - to get things done - and the word "defeat" doesn't easily appear in his lexicon either. And sometimes he has to impress his will as vigorously as he can if it's on the Program and he feels committed. And so we in return have to adopt an equally vigorous aggressive stance and try to impress our will and, of course, inform the country - because this is still the people's government.

QUESTION: Senator, have you yet been invited by the President or anyone in the Administration for a bi-partisan Conference on the India-Pakistan conflict?

DIRKSEN: No

QUESTION: Do you anticipate -

DIRKSEN: Well, I assume it's of real serious dimensions - and there may be such a thing as a conference in order to indicate what action the Administration contemplates or should take, but having no actual knowledge of it I can't answer you otherwise.

QUESTION: ... pretty well agreed what should be done as of this moment --

DIRKSEN: You say they're agreed?

QUESTION: You are agreeing with the Administration the way it's been handled so far?

DIRKSEN: Yes, the Administration hasn't done very much. I see U Thant has been sent out there for whatever that's worth. But you've got



to get a full appraisal of it and all the facts before a judgment can be rendered and before you can lay out a course of action.

QUESTION: Do you share Senator Mansfield's feeling that there should not be any unilateral action but we should act with the United Nations?

DIRKSEN: Well, I think up to a point that's quite true, but suppose the United Nations falls down and suppose this becomes the crucible out of which World War III can be spawned. And you get no action out of U.N. Then what? Can you then escape unilateral action?

QUESTION: Senator, back to 14(b). Can you estimate how long it will be before the Senate finishes its present business and gets to 14(b)?

DIRKSEN: Well, if it comes at the tail end, you can size up about like this: I would guess that the Farm Bill would take perhaps until next Tuesday; it will be followed by a highway bill; and then they'll call up the Immigration Bill - how much discussion there'll be I do not know - there is opposition to the Immigration Bill and I presume there will be a number of amendments. Now if an effort is made to remove the Western Hemisphere ceiling, it's going to precipitate a lot of discussion. And you could conceivably run until the end of the week. And now thereafter we have other things.

The sugar bill will be coming from the House but this morning in Senate Finance Committee there was a request - and in fact a command - for a hearing - so we'll have hearings on the sugar bill. There was a demand for hearings on this Canadian Agreement dealing with auto parts and auto specialties and that will take 2 days next week. Then, of course,



you've got the Foreign Aid Appropriation Bill and they just started hearings on it yesterday morning. It may take a little longer now in view of this Pakistan-India imbroglio. I do not know but I would assume that would be the case. Now there may be some other things and I'm thinking of course of Home Rule over in the House, because if that's going to truss up the House, obviously we're going to be here to do business, but it'll be at the end of this parade where 14(b) will logically come.

QUESTION: You spoke of the Immigration Bill - certain to be a number of amendments of it. In addition to the one Senator Ervin has brought up - what other amendments do you anticipate?

DIRKSEN: Well, I don't know. I know amendments were prepared and ready in the Senate Judiciary Committee to be offered if it became necessary.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: Not particularly - that is, insofar as I know. There were some to more particularize the functions of the Secretary of Labor with respect to an influx of people and its impact on our employment situation. That was one. He would have to make a survey twice a year to determine what skills were required and in what areas in order to more specifically identify what he should do - and then make a report to the Secretary of State. That is one, for example, and there are others along the same line.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: Well, using the word "committed" Dick - as I suppose you do - we're not committed to aid to anybody, as a matter of fact. This



becomes a very practical situation and you know that China - like an evil spectre - is in the background. So - will that add to the complications out there and will it complicate our problems in Vietnam? It's all in that same general area of the world. And it might very well do so.

QUESTION: ( Not clear )

DIRKSEN: Well, I have no particular present position on it, Jack. There are so many controversies in that bill, I haven't even gotten around to that one. It makes a good bargaining piece, I must say, but you think in terms of the Maritime Unions and others who are so insistent that shipments at least to the extent of 50% be made in American bottoms... now that has great appeal whether or not they want to keep it, whether or not remove it, whether there's a quid pro quo for it at the moment, I can't say. That's a very bewildering bill to say the least. Now I'm thinking around the periphery - after a while I'll get to the heart of the matter - particularly with respect to feed grains and to a dairy provision which was not included in a Senate version of the bill. A good deal of feeling on that, but I presume the greatest fight will come on cotton and I'm frank to say that Senators are lobbying each other right now, because there will be a major amendment offered and how it'll hit off, I don't know.

QUESTION: ( Not clear )

DIRKSEN: We'll try to contrive an agreement on Monday. I think I'm at liberty to say that there will be no session on Saturday. We'll come in earlier - say, 10 o'clock tomorrow - probably have a chance to dispose of a good many minor amendments, whether they'll hold these major



items until Monday, I'm not sure, but an effort will be made to get a time limit on the bill and also all amendments proposed after the time limit has been adopted.

QUESTION: You won't be voting on amendments tomorrow?

DIRKSEN: There could very well be - I don't know how long it will take for the general speeches to run, but I would gather that everybody who had a particular commodity would want to say something about it and that probably would extend the afternoon and a portion of tomorrow.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

FORD: The Home Rule Bill, I think, will not come before the House on Monday, next Monday, which is District Day... we have a number of 21-day rules available. I'm told that the Speaker has said they will be recognized and there will be no consideration of the District Home Rule Bill on Monday. It is eligible under the discharge petition on Monday, September 27th. I presume it will come up then, although I am told that that Monday is a Jewish Holiday and an effort may be made to put it over a day or perhaps for another two weeks. My own position is that I will not vote for a Home Rule Bill as long as the automatic payment provision is in it, I have many reservations about the ~~exp~~ de-Hatching provision in the Senate Bill... unless there are substantial changes of this nature, it's my intention to vote against the bill.

QUESTION: Are there others from your party with you - how many do you suppose from the Republican Party?

FORD: I think a great many Republicans are waiting to see what the content of the bill is. We haven't made a Whip check as to





the number that will vote for it if these changes are made.

QUESTION: Representative Ford, Senator Merton seemed to speak pessimistically about Republican chances next year...

FORD: It's my observation from speaking in some 27 states since January 4th that we have a good opportunity to pick up a substantial number of House seats in the next election. I would say a minimum of 30 and it could go as high as 50 or more.

QUESTION: (Asks something about financing of college education.)

FORD: Well, a good many people who have children in college do not make a great deal of money and as a result this particular proposal will be very helpful to a large number of families that have one or more children in schools of higher education. The Higher Education Act does help those who are in need and who are qualified scholastically... this particular provision will help a tremendous number of students going to public or private institutions - people who are not in a high income bracket under any circumstances.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

FORD: I presume the rationale is that we have the authority to by legislative action to turn these specific responsibilities over to the District of Columbia.

QUESTION: (Reading)... "in all cases whatsoever"... how would you interpret this?

FORD: Well, literally, I presume the argument can be made that we cannot abdicate our responsibilities, but I think it just as logically can be argued that if we pass a Home Rule Bill, we have



assumed our authority to legislate in this way and they, the people in the District of Columbia, can carry out the responsibilities under the Home Rule Bill. As I understand it, at least under some of the bills, the House and the Senate would have some additional authority with review and certainly if the matter of payment is involved, we would exercise a continuing responsibility in this area.

DIRKSEN: I think the word of the Constitution is not "legislation" but "jurisdiction" and I don't think that inhibits a delegation of power for the purposes of... interest of the public.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, do you share Mr. Ford's feeling about the automatic pay raise in the Home Rule Bill?

DIRKSEN: Well, I've been through that mill for years and years. Including the time when I was Chairman on the Committee on the District of Columbia in the House. That lump sum that we used to include in the Appropriation Bill for the District ranged in my time from as low as \$9 million to as high, I think, as \$27 million, but if I understand the evaluation formula in the present bill, they propose to evaluate all the Federal property in the District of Columbia for the purpose of determining how much property is dispossessed for tax purposes. Now if that's put in the hands of the District Assessor, he might very conceivably evaluate the grounds where the White House stands, the structure, what's in it, the Capitol, Rock Creek Park, all the buildings that are here... and you may come up with a very astronomical total. But the difficulty will be this: the Assessor may well come up with a figure that is automatic in nature, but it'll still require an appropriation to cover it and will the Congressional hackles then come up -

well, that's a fight we haven't gone through with as yet.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: I was really going around Robin Hood's Barn... and  
landing in Rock Creek Park! (LAUGHTER)



THE JOINT SENATE HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP

SENATOR DIRKSEN - REPRESENTATIVE FORD

September 30, 1965

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN: If you are ready... if the cameras are ready, we'll start.

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

During the first four years of the Eisenhower Administration the number of families below the \$3,000 income level (measured in terms of constant purchasing power at 1962 prices) was reduced at a rate of 400,000 a year. In four years since 1960, the number has been dropping at a rate of 250,000 a year.

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

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

The success of the Administration's anti-poverty efforts must be judged in these terms. The crucial question is whether these



efforts with their vast increase in Federal spending and their sizable bureaucracy accelerate the rate of reduction of the numbers of those in the lowest-income brackets. This question has become obscured in a paper blizzard of press releases from the White House and the Office of Economic Opportunity which provide some measurement of the effort of the Administration but yield <sup>very</sup> little <sup>real</sup> information about the/results.

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

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



STATEMENT BY REP. FORD: There are several glaring weaknesses in the anti-poverty program.

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

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

Disregard of State and local governments and their elected officials has made the term "war" an apt title for the poverty program. In altogether too many places it has become a war waged by local officials and competing private groups with each other for control of Federal funds and for partisan and for personal advantage. The poor are treated as the spoils in this conflict. They do not participate in the decisions on what should be done for them or to them.



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

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



QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: They are very much in shape. All the captains of the day have been selected, all the speakers for each day have been selected, the time has been properly divided between the majority and minority side and we are prepared to do battle and to do it with vigor. The Senate will operate as it has always operated... there will be no long sessions. I say that on the basis of my conversation with the majority leader yesterday and the day before.

Insofar as I can tell now, there will be no Saturday session the first week. There could be Saturday sessions later, but in any event, we are thoroughly structured if that's a good word. Now to carry on and to carry on for a long time.

And let me emphasize that on occasions I've heard it said that we were bluffing. If anybody's got any idea we're bluffing, you can dismiss it from your minds right now. This is serious business, this is a matter of principle and conviction with me and with others - and we mean to fight it out. And by way of implementation I have here a memorandum and a letter signed by 70 Republican members of the House. I read you only the last paragraph because they are so definitely in our corner:

"We therefore wish you luck and if success means remaining here until the snow flies - or later - that's all right, too. The importance of this issue clearly transcends any personal desires for the adjournment of Congress."

So WE mean business and THEY mean business - and that's it.



QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: Now, John, you wouldn't want me to disclose that here, would you? Well, because you'll be looking over the balustrade of the Press Gallery and every day you will notice who the captain is and you'll know who the speakers are. And besides, I'm not in the habit of telegraphing my punches well in advance.

QUESTION: This is not a clandestine operation - (LAUGHTER)

DIRKSEN: Well, it couldn't be clandestine when it's going to be out there on the Senate Floor and I apprehend as the public understands what it's all about that those galleries will be filled day after day. So there isn't anything clandestine in a goldfish bowl the size of the Senate Chamber.

QUESTION: How long -

DIRKSEN: Well, we can last a long time.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: I didn't hear it.

QUESTION: Do you have the support of the Republican Whip?

DIRKSEN: Well, I'd have to run through this list of names...

(LAUGHTER) I have the support of the minority leader... in the House of Representatives.

FORD: I have signed this letter to Senator Dirksen...

Les Arends has signed the letter... and all of the House Republican leadership are endorsing the action of Senator Dirksen and his troops.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: To whom?

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: The General is going to be right out there on the first day leading the forces. And Andy, I wish you'd change that word "extended"... we ought to think of a new term. Let's call it "attenuated"... (LAUGHTER)... somehow it just moves and moves and moves.

QUESTION: How about the word "filibuster?"

DIRKSEN: Well, Sam, you know that I never use the word "filibuster." I know it has some connotations that seem sinister to some people and I've never engaged in a filibuster. This is an informative effort to advise the country what the equities are in this thing and we mean to see that they're advised and I'm going to entreat you now to be sure to record the debate fully and fairly and put them out on the wire for the entire country. And I trust you can tell your publishers to keep it right on the front page every day because an effort at information merits that kind of consideration.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: There will be live quorums at the end of every attenuated discussion. (LAUGHTER) Andy, get accustomed to that word.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: Well, you know, I don't make any deals on principle and if it's wrong in September it is also wrong in January. And therefore there will be no change in stance in January. We'll fight it out on the same lines.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: Well, my dear, let me give you a little background. You see, at the time we had up Home Rule in the House, I was the Chairman of the House District Committee. I set up a subcommittee under the chairmanship of Congressman Auchincloss of New Jersey...

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: Well, wait a minute. You see, you always have to have the necessary background to come to a proper conclusion. (LAUGHTER)

Now, we did get the Home Rule bill to the floor but I remember that District Monday when there were 13 quorum calls and under House rules, the District has only two days a month - and if you do not finish on a given day, it goes over until the next District day. We had substantially the same result thereafter and we could see very clearly that we were not going to get a Home Rule bill, although I made a real endeavor.

Now, when the Senate Home Rule bill came up, notwithstanding its imperfections and defects, I gave it a vote. Yes, and there were a lot of things in it in which I did not concur.

Now you ask about what will happen from this point on since the House by a very substantial margin adopted this Sisk substitute. I'm not thoroughly familiar with it, although I'm familiar with some of its major provisions. And I would think that it would require the wisdom of a Solomon to put those two bills together and to bring about a conference report. And if it can be done, I shall stand in a state of wonderment and marvel ~~that~~ at the wisdom and ingenuity of the lawmakers.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: Well, that I cannot tell you. I can tell you this much: (because I have no secrets)... Senator Kennedy of Massachusetts has talked to me about it several times. I advised him that it had to take the normal course for nominations. First, it must be set up, it must be published in the Congressional Record at least 6 days before anything's done. That gives the public notice. Then it is referred to the Judiciary Committee. Then, in turn, to a subcommittee - usually 3 members of the Judiciary. They'll then set the day for the hearings.

Now I understand - and I have to rely mainly on what I've seen in your stories in the press - that the American Bar will oppose the nomination. I understand that the American Judicature Society will oppose the nomination. I understood that the Massachusetts Bar is opposed. Now - beyond that - there isn't much comment I can make, because from then on you have to wait for the candidate to present himself to the subcommittee and there he'll have his day in court - those who are opposed will have their day - this subcommittee will then have to determine what kind of a recommendation, if any, to make to the full committee.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: Well, I'm always cheered when it goes down, but frankly I've been doing a little work in that field. Now, when you talk about the cost of living, just don't pick out a succulent pork chop that you can sink a molar into, or even a juicy chunk of sirloin. Get the whole ball of wax - and that will include rent, it will include

clothing, it will include hardware, it will include drugs, it will include food - and you take a look at that and I think it presents a different picture and that we ARE in a state of inflation and the more we expend on projects and procurement where you don't generate consumer goods, the more accelerated that inflation will become. You can call it "crawling" you can call it "creeping" you could call it "inching" inflation, you can call it "galloping" inflation, but whatever term you call it, it is still inflation. And I made a statement in the Record only day before yesterday on which I think you might very profitably refresh yourself.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: Yes, sir.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

FORD: I think the War on Poverty ought to have a full-time director. I doubt if any person can handle the multitude of problems in the Peace Corps and the War on Poverty simultaneously. And with all the difficulties that are arising, all the adverse publicity that is developing as far as War on Poverty is concerned, it seems to me that we ought to get the best man on a full-time basis for that purpose.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

FORD: I wish he would make a decision which program he would like to run, or the President would make that decision for him.

DIRKSEN: Well, let me make one addition in answer to that. When you commit \$5 billion, four-hundred million for a 3-year period to a director or administrator in government - remembering, of course, that these are taxpayer's funds - if that doesn't merit a single-minded,

single-purpose, single director- to discharge that obligation - then I can think of nothing that will ever merit the complete time and attention of a single capable person to administer.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

DIRKSEN: Well, Bill, let me give you my estimate of the situation. First, and let me emphasize this with as much vigor as I can - that the John Birch Society is NOT a part of the Republican Party. It never was and I don't suppose it even pretends to be.

Secondly, let me say that in the American political scheme I do not believe there is any place or any room for any organization which operates on a secret basis to achieve political goals. Way back in Lincoln's day, as you remember, they had the "<sup>Know</sup> No Nothings" and if you asked them a question, asked them what they stood for, the answer was: "I know nothing."

Third, let me say that it's rather curious that General Walker, who supposedly is a member of this group, ran for office in Texas - not on the Republican ticket - but on the Democrat ticket - and got 100,000 votes.

Fourth, we have never been encumbered with any group like the Americans for Democratic Action. Now, if you want to talk about extremism, well, you can put your teeth into that. We do not believe in extremism, we got out a moderate platform in 1964, and we stand by it.

And finally, let me say, that insofar as I'm familiar with what the John Birch Society is seeking to do - and frankly not a single



piece of their literature has ever gone across my desk. So I don't know exactly what they do stand for. But I read in the press they're against the United Nations... the Republican Party isn't; they have demeaned some of the Republican leaders like the late John Foster Dulles, like President Eisenhower and others and tried to put on them an ideological tag that is at complete variance with a whole tradition of the Republican Party. We EMPHATICALLY reject that sort of thing and we stand on our platform, but I make it abundantly clear that they are NOT a part of the Republican Party. They never have been - and in my judgment they never will be.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

FORD: I would subscribe wholeheartedly <sup>to</sup> ~~with~~ the observations and comments of Senator Dirksen. I would like to point out in addition, however, that the Republican record in the House and in the Senate on such issues as the Civil Rights Act of 1964 - the Voting Rights Act of 1965 - the Republican Party supported those two legislative proposals very substantially, and if I understand correctly, the John Birch Society is opposed to BOTH of those laws that are now on the statute books. The legislative record of the Republican Party in the House and in the Senate is in substantial conflict with the views of the John Birch Society, a monolithic organization that takes its orders from the top and therefore there is no place for that organization in the Republican Party.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

FORD: I think it's well to point out, if I might, that the Democratic Party votes for the Sisk Bill were, I think, 120... almost

half of the Democrats who voted yesterday on the Sisk Bill voted for the Sisk Bill. So the Democratic Party made a substantial contribution to the success of the Sisk Bill.

The Republican Policy Committee statement in the House called for 3 important safeguards in Home Rule:

One, we said there had to be non-partisan elections.

Secondly, we said there had to be annual review of the Federal contribution to the District of Columbia. We said there had to be protection for the 28,000 or 30,000 government employees of the District of Columbia. We said there had to be the Hatch Act in effect in the District of Columbia - if there was Home Rule.

These requirements in my judgment were not met in the Sisk Bill - and for that reason I voted against the Sisk Bill and I think these were the reasons that most of the Republicans did vote that way.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

FORD: Well, I suppose they...

QUESTION: (Interruption)

FORD: I voted that way because I did not believe the Sisk Bill met the requirements of the House Republican Policy Committee's statement. I suspect the 120 Democrats supported the Sisk Bill - amendment or substitute offered by the Northern Democrats - followed that line against the wishes of President Johnson because of their own feelings concerning the proper way to proceed in the Home Rule dispute.

QUESTION: (Not clear)



FORD: Well, I think all of you know - and Senator Dirksen said - the two bills, the one passed by the House and the one passed by the Senate - are diametrically opposed. It will take the wisdom of Solomon to try to put this patchwork together. I don't envy the responsibilities ~~now~~ of those who are appointed to the conference committee from the House and Senate in trying to work out a solution. I don't say it's impossible, but it's mighty improbable that they can come up with something that is satisfactory.



GOP LEADERSHIP PRESS CONFERENCE

October 23, 1965

SENATOR DIRKSEN: So here goes for the last presentation that we shall make to you this year... with the exception, I suppose, of what we will have to say when the Coordinating Committee comes to Washington in December. (Note: Comment made from audience - not clear.)

Well, Mr. Bill, I'm not quite sure. (LAUGHTER) I think the President overlooked me a little last night. I guide him a good deal on the telephone and I suppose I kept him so busy that he couldn't tell me what he had in mind for next year. I believe he told Gerry and after Gerry got it all down, I began to suffer from writer's cramp. (LAUGHTER)

Well, let's see what we have here this morning. You gentlemen with those machines... are fully prepared... thank you, sir.

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

A move of the 89th Congress would be like an episode of the old-time serial which always ended as the heroine was pushed off the cliff or was about to be ground up by an oncoming locomotive. Not until you see the thrilling episode that will be presented in this theater



next year will you know whether 14(b) of Taft-Hartley is ground to bite under the Administration's locomotive or whether the Reapportionment Amendment survives its fall off the cliff.

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

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

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

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



STATEMENT BY REP. GYRALD R. FORD: The first session of the 89th Congress clearly demonstrates the evils of one-party dominance of the national government.

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

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

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

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

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

State and local governments have suffered because of one-party dominance in this Congress. Congress has enacted far-reaching programs without concern for the views of responsible state and local officials or the effect of Federal action on state and local programs. Especially significant was the Democratic attempt to deprive governors of any shred of veto power over projects under the poverty program.

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

QUESTION: (Not clear)

FORD: Well, when Hale Boggs and I talked to him to ask whether there was any more in the way of messages, he seemed to have a summary of the things he thought hadn't been done... I can't recall all the specifics... but he did indicate that there were some things we had not done that he hoped we would have and that we probably would be urged to do in the next Congress. He listed - Oh, I would say - 8 or 10 things that in his opinion should have been done that fell by the way-side. I must say that they didn't seem too significant in the overall - compared to the tonnage of legislation which was dropped on our doorsteps and which the Congress approved during this past session.

QUESTION: (Not clear)

FORD: I ...well, he did speak about the truth in lending, the truth in packaging legislation...

QUESTION: ...14(b) -

FORD: I don't think he speaks very emphatically about that, but I think the fact that he suffered some difficulties in the last week or so in this regard may have indicated that he was not talking too emphatically about that right now.

QUESTION: What about Home Rule? Did he mention that?

FORD: It's my recollection that he did.

QUESTION: Is there any question that in your 3rd paragraph of your prepared statement here referring to Judge Morrissey - when you talked about a man totally devoid of qualifications for the Federal position?



FORD: I think that fits the picture... uh... quite well. But on the record as to the qualifications, I would defer to Senator Dirksen who is on the Committee on the Judiciary in the Senate and who knows the history far more in detail than do I.

QUESTION: There is no doubt this is the case you're referring to, though -

FORD: I think that's right.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, as the critic and reviewer of this Congress, would you give it 4 stars - or 3 - or two and a half?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I'd have to divide it up into segments, I think. Take, for instance, this question of overlap. Instead of 3 or 4 or 2½... probably a half star. Take, for instance, the overlap in the Public Works and Development Act with Appalachia, or take the overlap of Appalachia with the Federal Aid Program... and that's particularly true in the field of highways in public health. Then take the overlap in respect of elementary and secondary education aimed at low-income areas where it overlaps with the educational attributes of the War on Poverty.

Now in that field I don't know that it rates any stars particularly because it only means that these things were hastily done and are going to have to be fixed - unless you're going to have many governmental agencies all pursuing similar objectives and probably in many cases the right hand not knowing what the left hand does.

So to try to generalize on a 4-star, 3-star, 2-star basis - would be, I think, a little difficult.

QUESTION: On this question though - could we go into your views on Congressional oversights... (Note: rest not clear.)...

DIRKSEN: It certainly should. There ought to be great emphasis on legislative oversight. As a matter of fact, when we passed the Legislative Reorganization Act in 1946, I served on that Joint Committee way back in those days in the House. And this business of oversight received such a great deal of emphasis. However, there was no follow-through and it's the one place where the Congress is lacking in endeavor and secondly, it is too often timid about providing the necessary funds and the necessary staffs that do a good job.

Now if you want an illustration, I was Chairman of Agricultural Appropriations in the House many years ago. It was a streamlined effort because I didn't have much staff to work with, but I sent 'em down to the other end of the avenue... right into the Department of Agriculture. Wickart was the Secretary at that time. I said I want you to provide him with space and with clerical assistance and when he asks a Bureau Head to come in, I intend that you send that Bureau Head in there, so that Mr. Orr, who is a dedicated public servant, gets what he wants. Then I sent 'em out to Alaska to take a look at what was going on out there and we achieved some results. We even got some people fired in REA at high level and got others suspended. It shows what you can do if you're tooled up for the oversight job. And it needs an abundance of attention.. in the next session.

QUESTION: Have you had any indication whether the White House will be cooperative about this smoothing out the rough edges of the legislation passed?

DIRKSEN: Well, John, that's not the question. The Congress is a coordinate branch of government, it has exclusive power over the purse





under the Constitution... it therefore has a solemn, inescapable duty to do this job quite aside from what the Executive Branch might think.

QUESTION: Senator, aren't you sort of proud of your own record in this Congress... what you did on the Voting Rights Bill and 14(b)?

DIRKSEN: Oh, Frank, you know... I'm the modest type. I don't like to talk about those things but I do experience in those introspective moments a bit of satisfaction and gratification that certain things to which I address my energies turned out very well in the interest of the people. You didn't put down a single word either!  
(LAUGHTER)

QUESTION: Senator, what is your fondest memory of this long session?

DIRKSEN: My what?

QUESTION: Your fondest memory -

DIRKSEN: Oh, you know, sometimes the things that bring little hurts are fond recollections and I don't like to talk about them. But I think one of the greatest things about this Congress so far as the Senate is concerned is the magnificent cooperation of a very humble, dedicated Senator by the name of Mike Mansfield who never gets his eye off the ball of public interest no matter where his trail may lead. And I salute him for his cooperation and for his determination to make the Senate a working body as the Constitution of the United States provided. You couldn't ask for anything more.

Senator Dirksen and

QUESTION: (Asks/Representative Ford to single out specific legislation...)

DIRKSEN: Oh, that's a wholly comparative matter and since in the President's letter to Senator Mansfield he mentioned 86 items for me to reach into thin air and piece out what I think was most important and the least important... would be a bit difficult.

QUESTION: Not important, necessarily...

DIRKSEN: Well, whether it's important or whether it merited emphasis... of course, it depends on who you ask and what his identity may be. If you ask the generality of people - particularly those over 65 - they would say to you: Social Security and Medicare. If you asked one group of farmers, they would say the Farm Bill. But if you asked a much larger group of farmers, they would say "Not at all," because they were quite opposed to the Farm Bill.

So picking out tops and bottoms is not an easy matter.

QUESTION: As Republican leader - in your opinion - what was the worst piece of legislation -

DIRKSEN: You say the "worst" thing? Well, it occurs to me among others that the effort to completely denude the governors of the 50 states of any real veto authority over some of these highly dubious projects that have been undertaken is a long step toward monolithic government in this country.

QUESTION: Senator, do you agree with the President that this is the greatest Congress in the history of the Republic?

DIRKSEN: Well, it depends on what you mean by "greatest." If you're talking about volume, probably that's the right term... because



this was a very productive grist mill in terms of pages of legislation. Gerry, did you use the word "tonnage?" I think "tonnage" is a pretty good term. Let us say 20,000 pages of Administrative and Executive orders in the Federal Register... 55,000 nominations that came before the Senate... over 16,000 bills and resolutions introduced in this First Session of the 89th Congress. Goodness, how lucky the people can deem themselves when they look at this mountain of legislative brain-children and discover how few of them percentage-wise actually get on the statute books. They are to be congratulated. But there you're always appraising in terms of volume.

But I tried to mention that it's not quantity, it's quality. When I was in grade school I remember those composition books we used to buy with a couple of large "Qms's" on the front page... double "Qm" composition book... quantity, because it had lots of paper in it and quality, because it was lined and fairly smooth. Well, I just strike out one of those "Qms's"... it's quality that counts.

QUESTION: Mr. Ford, would you respond to that?

FORD: In my appraisal of the best legislation, I would say the Higher Education Act - with the exception of the Teacher Corps Provision... would be the best legislation. Probably the worst provision enacted by the Congress in this session was the rent subsidy aspect, or provision, in the Housing Bill. It seems to me the Congress on second reflection indicated its opposition to both the Teacher Corps and the Rent Subsidy Program by not appropriating any funds for either program.

Both the rent subsidy and the Teacher Corps Provision in the two major bills would be at the bottom of the list with the Higher Education Bill - with the one exception - at the top.

I'd like to make this observation if I might. Probably the most disappointing thing that I experienced in this session of the Congress was the reaction of far too many of my good Democratic friends on the other side of the aisle when this volume of messages, this tonnage of proposed legislation, was shovelled at our doorstep... too many of my good Democratic friends would not know whether to clap their hands or click their heels. And the net result was in my judgment - a hip-pocket Congress - as far as the actions of this Congress were concerned.

QUESTION: Garry, in view of all this tonnage, evidently there will be benefits for a lot of different groups in this country. In view of this, what chance do you think the Republicans have for a come-back next year?

FORD: I'm very optimistic that in the House races we will make substantial gains in the '66 elections. I've been in over 30 states since January 4th and my observation is one of optimism. I think we'll gain a minimum of 30 and it could go substantially higher as a result of the elections in November of 1966.

QUESTION: If you don't control the White House, you don't have a legislative working majority on the floor of the Congress, but you want a record of opposition... write a record that you can bring to the people and say: This is why you should elect us.        Specifies.

FORD: I think there will develop, Andy, because of the magnitude of the legislation which has been enacted... and because of the tremendous amount of money that's available to the Executive Branch of the government... with virtually no restrictions. There will be many, many opportunities to point out the bad administration under this Administration. And it will give us an opportunity to point out that the best asset that President Johnson could have through '67 and '68 would be a good, tough, investigating Republican Congress in the last two years of his Administration.

DIRESEN: Andy, let me amplify that a little. There's quite a controversy out on right now with respect to the application of the provisions of the new Social Security Bill... that we got out in this session. There are administrators who are now taking the position that with this 7% ... yes, 7% increase... that they are entitled to reduce the assistance rendered to these people in addition to Social Security by just that amount.

Now when you note the number of Social Security beneficiaries today, what do you think they're going to think about it? And when, for instance, your veterans are penalized under provisions of the Social Security Act, what do you think they're going to think?

Now it's the impact of these things on the country... that is going to have the real political effect. It has always been so - and regardless of organization or who occupies what position, whether the White House or the Congress, the people will do the voting and it's in

proportion as they are socially and economically affected that their votes are going to be conditioned. And that's why already in these seminars schools are giving a great deal of attention to this subject - the changes in social, economic and political opinion in this country now.

I just answered a letter to a University that wanted me to participate in a seminar on that very subject - and those invitations are coming in. They are aware of it. And they know changing opinion.

QUESTION: Are you as optimistic relatively as Mr. Ford... to the Senate as Mr. Ford is to the House?

DIRKSEN: We have a somewhat different picture. In the first place, ALL House members will be up for re-election. You will have only one-third of the Senate up. Now you have to rationalize that a little as to what states are involved, whether they're in the South, West, or North, and exactly what those factors are. So arithmetically speaking, we're not in as good shape in the Senate although I'm of the opinion that we're going to pick up some Senators. Now don't ask me to name the states because that would be giving away my secret and I've got to have a few secrets at least.

QUESTION: (Asks a question about Jenner of Illinois...)

DIRKSEN: Well, I'm glad you used the word "speculation" because it is a speculation. Albert Jenner in my judgment is one of the greatest lawyers - trial lawyers or counsels - anywhere in the United States. And I'm sure he has an extremely lucrative law practice. Now, anybody who emerges from the crowd a little is subsequently considered for a political role. When I was out there last they said



\_\_\_\_\_ candidate for the United States Senate. I cannot tell whether that's true or not. But when the hope begins to rise so does speculation... and so does political ambition. But that will all sort of ease along.

QUESTION: You have a choice -

DIRKSEN: I have no choice. I have no choice at the moment.

FORD: I would like to say we're going to send you a Republican senator from the state of Michigan at the next election - and this would be, I'm sure, a big help. We've got a number of good candidates including Bob Griffin, who is a potential candidate, and several others. We'll have at least one more, I'm confident, in '67.

DIRKSEN: Well, Gerry, I've just got to say... knowing what the situation was in 1950 - the odds were 10 to 1 that I could not come to the Senate - but strangely enough I got here.

~~FORD~~: MERRY CHRISTMAS!



# REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

By Walter Trohan  
CHIEF OF CHICAGO TRIBUNE'S WASHINGTON BUREAU  
(Copyright 1965 by the Chicago Tribune)

Ford Making  
His Mark as  
Head Coach of  
House G.O.P.

**W**ASHINGTON, Oct. 22—Rep. Gerald Rudolph Ford Jr. [R., Mich.], a former football player who passed up a career in pro football for law, is making good as head coach of a disorganized squad of Republicans in the House.

When Ford took over the post of Republican minority leader in the House from veteran Rep. Charles A. Halleck [Ind.] early this year, there were fears that his indecision might set his party back even further than the voters had in giving the Democrats better than a two-to-one margin of control. However, Ford has succeeded in building an effective team out of a minority group.

Perhaps no man in Congress can escalate the temper of President Johnson as high and as quickly as Ford. He has made the President eat crow on civil rights and Viet Nam.

When Johnson accused Republicans of dragging their feet on civil rights, Ford was quick to show that the G. O. P. consistently has supported civil rights, whereas Johnson opposed attempts to promote civil rights on 78 per cent of 50 roll calls during his Senate and House service, and on 100 per cent of them up to 1957. When the President charged Ford with breaking the confidence of a top-level White House meeting on Viet Nam, Ford was able to clear himself and imply that Johnson had shot from the lip.



Trohan

[N. Y.], who has been effective in directing a Republican educational campaign.

On 29 roll call votes only 6.7 per cent of House Republicans deviated from the party majority in their votes as compared to 23 per cent for House Democrats

From his selection as G.O.P. leader by the narrow margin of six votes, Ford has been tireless in stumping the country in an effort to find personable and attractive young Republicans to seek seats in Congress in 1966. In this he has had the active cooperation of Laird and other members of his team.

If the Republicans make gains in the next congressional election, a good share of the credit will go to Ford and his team. It goes without saying that success will not endear him to Johnson, who already has refused to invite him to the White House to discuss differences.

## Ford Is Annoying, If Not Effective

**T**HE PRESIDENT HAS tempted Ford with offers of crumbs from the Democratic table, but Ford has refused to be diverted from his role of opposition leader. Ford consistently has hit the President for his swal overn Congress.

Johnson doesn't like criticism. In this respect Ford has been annoying if not effective in view of the heavy majority of 293 Democrats. Many Republicans believe that the President finds it hard to believe that Ford's opposition is based on conviction and integrity.

Democrats have been constant in harassment of Ford, which Republicans suspect is at White House orders. This hasn't lessened Ford's drive or purpose.

Ford doesn't take kindly to defeat. He played center on the undefeated Michigan teams of 1932 and 1933 and was voted the most valuable player on the 1934 squad. He had a taste of pro football in playing in the 1935 All-Star game, but decided to go to Yale law school.

He played only a few minutes in the All-Star game, but has been playing 60 minutes in the House and calling on his G.O.P. colleagues to do the same. Ford has forged an effective staff of coaching assistants in Leslie C. Arends [Ill.], Republican whip; John J. Rhodes [Ariz.], chairman of the G.O.P. policy committee; Bob Wilson [Cal.] chairman of the Republican House campaign committee, and Melvin R. Laird [Wis.], chairman of the House G.O.P. conference.

## Emerging as Behind-the-Scenes Power

**B**EHIND THESE ARE men in lesser positions in the G.O.P. command, but of great influence: Among these are quiet and soft-spoken Rep. Glenard Lipscomb [Cal.], who is emerging as a power behind the scenes, and Rep. Charles E. Goodell

by Dr. Mustard

