

The original documents are located in Box D16, folder “Republican Women's Conference, Sheraton Park Hotel, April 26, 1963” 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 The Council donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections.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.

Address by Rep. Gerald R. Ford

Republican Womens' Conference - Sheraton Park Hotel

Friday, April 26, 1963

Today I want to discuss two important issues being faced by the Republicans in the House of Representatives. One has to do with minority staffing of Committees and the other with the withholding of vital information from the Congress by the Executive Branch of the Government.

Republicans in the House have moved ahead on several fronts in the early months of this Congress. The Republican Conference has been put to new and potentially significant uses. We have appointed a special Subcommittee on Nuclear Test Ban Negotiations under Congressman Craig Hosmer of California, the ranking Republican on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The Test Ban Committee has received position papers from such distinguished experts as Edward Teller, former AEC Chairman Lewis Strauss, and Chief U. S. disarmament negotiator William C. Foster - and its reports have been given wide press coverage. We have also set up a Subcommittee on Increased Minority Staffing under Congressman Fred Schwengel of Iowa.

At the opening of the Congress the Conference adopted a package of "fair play" amendments including a demand for "equal time" for the minority in debating Conference Committee reports. We didn't win that fight but we did put the Democratic leadership on notice that the minority was going to play a more active role in the future.

The Republicans on the House Appropriation Committee under a special committee headed by Congressman Bow of Ohio have reviewed the President's budget in detail with the assistance of former Budget Director Maurice Stans. The Republicans on Education and Labor and Judiciary have developed alternative Republican proposals in important legislative fields. The House Republican Policy Committee under the able leadership of Cong. John Byrnes of Wisconsin has been doing an excellent job on the vital issues before us.

Yes, this has been a period of new Republican activity--of hard work in reviewing the Kennedy administration's proposals and in developing Republican alternatives. Our batting average has not been 100% but we expect to improve our percentage of success in the months ahead.

One of the most important problems we have tackled is the issue of minority staffing. All the rest of the work we are attempting to accomplish presupposes adequate professionally competent committee staff. There is a limit--a real limit--to how much an individual Congressman or group of Congressmen working in cooperation can accomplish in a given twenty-four hour period. Each of us has his constituency and its interests to serve. Just keeping abreast of our committee work--preparing for hearings, interrogating witnesses, drafting legislation and reports, handling bills on the floor is a full-time job. And then there are the inevitable social and political obligations of life in the Nation's Capital as well as in the home district. Time is a Congressman's most precious commodity. Staff assistance is essential to us if we are to function effectively.

One of the most serious limitations the Republican minority in Congress has been faced with has been inadequate committee staff. Last year Roscoe Drummond wrote a series of columns which you may have read dramatizing our position to the nation. Drummond estimated that we Republicans in the House were being shortchanged 12 to 1 on committee staff although the Democratic-Republican ratio in House membership was closer to 3 to 2. Some readers misunderstood him to mean that there were 12 Democrats on committee staffs to every Republican. This is not the case--most of our committees have professional staff that have served for many years. Some are Republicans that were hired during the early years of the Eisenhower administration. The point that Drummond was making was that the great bulk of the professional staff on our committees were under the control and responsible to the Democratic majority or Democratic Chairman. Only a small fraction work exclusively for the minority. This has meant that in too many instances minority views were not being written when bills were reported, that committee investigations were being carried out almost exclusively from the majority point of view. I might add that the worst partisan abuse of the concept of professional nonpartisan staff--as set out in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946--has come on a few committees with large budgets for investigatory staff, such as the Education and Labor Committee. Without minority staff we have not been in a position on certain committees to draft Republican alternatives or to initiate legislation where the administration has faltered.

Because of the central importance of staffing, the Republican Conference unanimously endorsed a proposal by Congressman Fred Schwengel of Iowa which would have given the minority 40% of the committee staff on committees where the majority of the Republicans were dissatisfied with the staff assistance they were getting. Congressman Schwengel is now chairing our Conference Subcommittee on Increased Minority Staffing. He and his committee have been performing yeomen's service in

gathering data on the staffing problem, in pressing for more staff at the committee level, in arguing our case before the House Administration Committee which approves all committee budgets, and in planning future strategy in the staffing fight.

Congressman Schwengel estimates that we shall have 30 more minority staff members this year than we had in the last Congress, largely as a result of his committee's work. Furthermore the Majority Leader, Carl Albert, as a result of the fight for more minority staff has pledged his party to eliminate partisan abuse in staffing and to abide by the spirit of the Reorganization Act. We intend to hold him to his word.

On the Senate side our big guns have begun to swing into action although I might add after our foot soldiers launched the offensive. We welcome their assistance. You may have seen Senator Goldwater's column a few Sunday's ago. Senator Goldwater said that:

"Insufficient minority staffing makes legislation more dependent than ever upon the statistics, the witnesses, the proposals of the Democratic administration as transmitted through the majority. I would make this point just as emphatically if the situation were reversed and the proper committee staffing denied to the Democrats. The need is for proper policies, properly researched, properly arrived at and understood above and beyond the desires of the particular Administration running the Executive Branch."

Senator Dirksen has recently urged all ranking minority members on the standing committees of the Senate to press for more staff assistance to service the needs of the minority.

I have been discussing the problem of minority staff but this is only a part of a much larger problem that the staffing fight has dramatically illustrated. The Congress at large just does not have the staff resources it needs if it is to perform its proper role in our Constitutional system. We have seen the gradual and continuing erosion of power from the legislature to the executive in the past thirty years. One of the major intents of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 was to reestablish balance to provide Congress with professional staff for its legislative committees. This was a real gain for effective Congressional government but we have not kept pace with the times. There are numerous specific examples in both the House and Senate right today and the country is the loser because of this deficiency.

Most members of Congress would agree on how crucial the staffing issue is not only to a vigorous and constructive opposition but also for the survival of Congress as a meaningful participant in our processes of government.

A good part of the minority staffing problem would be solved with the correction of this broader problem. There is a clear need for a selective increase in the professional nonpartisan staff of the committees in areas of deficiency such as I have just noted. Ultimately we may be moving toward the kind of staffing arrangement

that Congressman Tom Curtis has suggested--a "three-part staff" with the bulk of the staff professional and nonpartisan (i.e. available to all members regardless of party affiliation) with a few staff members, also professional qualified, under the direct control of the majority and minority respectively--for the purpose of drafting majority and minority reports and assisting the members on issues of a more immediate party political nature.

What, you ask, can I or my club do to help solve these problems? You can help by writing your Congressman and Senators be they Democrat or Republican and asking them how they stand on the staffing issue. Congressmen don't vote by weighing their mail but they will certainly sit up and take notice of an issue on which they receive intelligent letters. Particularly in a case such as this where we are discussing a problem peculiar to Congress, its methods of operation, and its public image. Congressmen are especially sensitive to the views and judgments of their constituents. Write and ask your Congressman if he feels that Congress is meeting its responsibilities in reviewing and considering executive proposals for new spending and legislation. Is Congress adequately overseeing the executive agencies? The Billie Sol Estes case is only one example--albeit an extreme one-- of how the system can get out of order. Is Congress showing the leadership that the times demand? And within this broader context can Congress function at all without a mature responsible opposition that has the staff resources to perform its role as critic and to assure that more than one side of the issue is considered? These are mighty important questions. We are not dealing in petty partisan politics but in issues that effect the course of our democracy.

I want to move now to another issue affecting the basic principles of our democratic way of life and our constitutional system of government.

One of the least dramatic, but most serious problems which has come up during the last two years concerns the very foundation of our ideals of representative government. It affects me personally, and through me it affects the 462,000 residents of Michigan I represent. But as a matter of fact the principle involved affects all members of Congress and all their constituents. I am speaking of a little-publicized idea called "executive privilege." This is how I came up against it several weeks ago:

General Maxwell D. Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was testifying before our defense appropriations subcommittee about the Cuban situation. We were asking him some important and searching questions about the Bay of Pigs invasion-- which I might say will be looked on as one of the darkest pages in the history of American foreign policy and a page written exclusively by the Kennedy Administration.

Our committee had a right and a need to know how our government handled that mess, for we pass on all the money spent by the Defense Department, and if they don't use it properly, we have the right and responsibility to know so any corrective action can be taken.

I had been disturbed by some news stories which had been appearing just before our meeting with General Taylor which you may remember--these had to do with what went wrong at the time of the invasion and whether or not the United States ever promised any air cover for the Cuban refugee invaders. I wanted to clear that matter up and to get into some other obvious problems connected with that fiasco which would help our committee decide how to vote when it came time to appropriate money for the Department of Defense and related agencies.

General Taylor was one of the best men in the country to answer these important questions. He had been appointed by President Kennedy to head a four-man board to investigate the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion and find out what went wrong. The investigation was made and the board informed the President what it found out. Then, according to testimony to us and other public statements, the four were told by the President to say nothing about the investigation.

So what happened? Three of the members of the board did follow instructions. Admiral Arleigh Burke, former Chief of Naval Operations did, Allen Dulles, former CIA Chief did, and General Taylor did. But Bobby Kennedy, the fourth member didn't. In one of the classic examples of news management we have seen in this country, Bobby told his version of the invasion to reporters from U. S. News and World Report and the Knight Newspapers. He was in Palm Beach at the time.

Now like all good elephants, we Republicans have long memories. I would like you to recall with me here today some of Mr. Kennedy's own words and compare them with his performance in this very important incident.

First of all, let me read you a section out of the Democratic platform which bears directly on this subject. (Not that the platform makes any difference, you understand, to the Democrats. Its greatest value over the years has been to Republicans who are constantly able to show how hypocritical they are about saying one thing and doing another.) The 1960 platform said: "We reject the Republican contention that the workings of the government are the special private preserve of the Executive. The massive wall of secrecy erected between the Executive Branch and the Congress as well as the citizen, must be torn down. Information must flow freely, save in those areas in which the national security is involved."

So on the basis of this strongly worded platform, Senator Kennedy campaigned. As a candidate he gave us lots of words about how under his administration the public would be well informed and how their representatives in Congress would never be denied information they needed to pass the laws of the land.

At one point he said--very eloquently, I think---"The President--who himself bears much of the responsibility for the preservation of American Democracy--has the affirmative duty to see to it that the American People are kept fully informed. It is true that in today's world of peril some government information must be kept secret--information whose publication would endanger the national security. The people of the United States are entitled to the fullest possible information about their government and the President must see that they receive it."

Also on the campaign he referred specifically to executive privilege. He said that whenever information is not restricted by specific statute, security needs, or the Constitution, "there is no justification for using the doctrine of executive privilege to keep that information from the Congress and the public."

I hurry to add that in the case of General Taylor's refusal, no specific statute would prohibit him from testifying, no security is involved, and the Constitution gives no justification for his position at all. Continuing down "memory lane," I recall that in his first State of the Union message, Mr. Kennedy made every Congressman's and newspaperman's heart warm with this statement:

"For my part, I shall withhold from neither the Congress nor the people any fact, or report, past, present or future, which is necessary for an informed judgment of our conduct and hazards."

The fact of the matter, from my own personal experience with General Taylor and the Bay of Pigs, is that the President is keeping the Congress and the public in the dark; he is managing the news; he is preventing the lawfully elected representatives of the people from making informed judgments of the past conduct of our government and therefore the future hazards which we face. This, I submit, is contrary to everything representative government stands for, to everything we Republicans stand for, and if we can believe their platform--everything the Democrats themselves stand for.

Address by Rep. Gerald R. Ford, Republican Womens' Conference, Sheraton Park Hotel, April 26, 1963.

Today I want to discuss two important issues being faced by the Republicans in the House of Representatives. One has to do with minority staffing of Committees and the other with the withholding of vital information from the Congress by the Executive Branch of the Government.

Republicans in the House have moved ahead on several fronts in the early months of this Congress. The Republican Conference has been put to new and potentially significant uses. We have appointed a Special Subcommittee on Nuclear Test Ban Negotiations under Congressman Craig Hosmer of California, the ranking Republican on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The Test Ban Committee has received position papers from such distinguished experts as Edward Teller, former AEC Chairman Lewis Strauss, and Chief U.S. disarmament negotiator William C. Foster -- and its reports have been given wide press coverage. We have also set up a Subcommittee on Increased Minority Staffing under Congressman Fred Schwengel of Iowa.

At the opening of the Congress the Conference adopted a package of "fair play" amendments including a demand for "equal time" for the minority in debating Conference Committee reports. We didn't win that fight but we did put the Democratic leadership on notice that the minority was going to play a more active role in the future.

The Republicans on the House Appropriation Committee under a special committee headed by Congressman Bow of Ohio have reviewed the President's budget in detail with the assistance of former Budget Director Maurice Stans. The Republicans on Education and Labor and Judiciary have developed alternative Republican proposals in important legislative fields. The House Republican Policy Committee under the able leadership of Cong. John Byrnes of Wisconsin has been doing an excellent job on the vital issues before us.

Yes, this has been a period of new Republican activity -- of hard work in reviewing the Kennedy administration's proposals and in developing Republican alternatives. Our batting average has not been 100% but we expect to improve our percentage of success in the months ahead.

One of the most important problems we have tackled is the issue of minority staffing. All the rest of the work we are attempting to accomplish presupposes adequate professionally competent committee staff. There is a limit -- a real limit -- to how much an individual Congressman or group of Congressmen working in cooperation can accomplish in a given twenty-four hour period. Each of us has his constituency and its interests to serve. Just keeping abreast of our committee work -- preparing for hearings, interrogating witnesses, drafting legislation and reports, handling bills on the floor is a full-time job. And then there are the inevitable social and political obligations of life in the Nation's Capitol as well as in the home district. Time is a Congressman's precious commodity. Staff assistance is essential to us if we are to function effectively.

One of the most serious limitations the Republican minority in Congress has been faced with has been inadequate staff. Last year Roscoe Drummond wrote a series of columns which you may have read dramatizing our position to the nation. Drummond estimated that we Republicans in the House were being shortchanged 12 to 1 on committee staff although the Democratic-Republican ratio in House membership was closer to 3 to 2. Some readers misunderstood him to mean that there were 12 Democrats on committee staffs to every Republican. This is not the case -- most of our committees have professional staff that have served for many years. Some are Republicans that were hired during the early years of the Eisenhower administration. The point that Drummond was making was that the great bulk of the professional staff on our committees were under the control and responsible to the Democratic majority. This has meant that in too many instances minority views were not being written when bills were reported, that committee investigations were being carried out almost exclusively from the majority point of view. I might add that the worst partisan abuse of the concept of professional nonpartisan staff -- as set out in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 -- has come on a few committees with large budgets for investigatory staff, such as the Education and Labor Committee. Without minority staff we have not been in a position on certain committees to draft Republican alternatives or to initiate legislation where the administration has faltered.

Because of the central importance of staffing, the Republican Conference unanimously endorsed a proposal by Congressman Fred Schwengel of Iowa which would have given the minority 40% of the committee staff on committees where the majority of the Republicans were dissatisfied with the staff assistance they were getting. Con-

gressman Schwengel is now chairing our Conference Subcommittee on Increased Minority Staffing. He and his committee have been performing yeomen's service in gathering data on the staffing problem, in pressing for more staff at the committee level, in arguing our case before the House Administration Committee which approves all committee budgets, and in planning future strategy in the staffing fight.

Congressman Schwengel estimates that we shall have 30 more minority staff members this year than we had in the last Congress, largely as a result of his committee's work. Furthermore the Majority Leader, Carl Albert, as a result of the fight for more minority staff has pledged his party to eliminate partisan abuse in staffing and to abide by the spirit of the Reorganization Act. We intend to hold him to his word.

On the Senate side our big guns have begun to swing into action although I might add after our foot soldiers launched the offensive. We welcome their assistance. You may have seen Senator Goldwater's column a few Sundays ago. Senator Goldwater said that:

"Insufficient minority staffing makes legislation more dependent than ever upon the statistics, the witnesses, the proposals of the Democratic administration as transmitted through the majority. I would make this point just as emphatically if the situation were reversed and the proper committee staffing denied to the Democrats. The need is for proper policies, properly researched, properly arrived at and understood above and beyond the desires of the particular Administration running the Executive Branch."

Senator Dirksen has recently urged all ranking minority members on the standing committees of the Senate to press for more staff assistance to service the needs of the minority.

I have been discussing the problem of minority staff but this is only a part of a much larger problem that the staffing fight has dramatically illustrated. The Congress at large just does not have the staff resources it needs if it is to perform its proper role in our Constitutional system. We have seen the gradual and continuing erosion of power from the legislative to the executive in the past thirty years. One of the major intents of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 was to reestablish balance to provide Congress with professional staff for its legislative committees. This was a real gain for effective Congressional government but we have not kept pace with the times. There are numerous specific examples in both the House and Senate right today and the country is the loser because of this deficiency.

Most members of Congress would agree on how crucial the staffing issue is not only to a vigorous and constructive opposition but also for the survival of Congress as a meaningful participant in our processes of government.

A good part of the minority staffing problem would be solved with the correction of this broader problem. There is a clear need for a selective increase in the professional nonpartisan staff of the committees in areas of deficiency such as I have just noted. Ultimately we may be moving toward the kind of staffing arrangement that Congressman Tom Curtis has suggested -- a "three-part staff" with the bulk of the staff professional and nonpartisan (i.e. available to all members regardless of party affiliation) with a few staff members, also professional qualified, under the direct control of the majority and minority respectively -- for the purpose of drafting majority and minority reports and assisting the members on issues of a more immediate party political nature.

What, you ask, can I or my club do to help solve these problems? You can help by writing your Congressmen and Senators be they Democrat or Republican and asking them how they stand on the staffing issue. Congressmen don't vote by weighing their mail but they will certainly sit up and take notice of an issue on which they receive intelligent letters. Particularly in a case such as this where we are discussing a problem peculiar to Congress, its methods of operation, and its public image. Congressmen are especially sensitive to the views and judgments of their constituents. Write and ask your Congressman if he feels that Congress is meeting its responsibilities in reviewing and considering executive proposals for new spending and legislation. Is Congress adequately overseeing the executive agencies? The Billie Sol Estes case is only one example -- albeit an extreme one -- of how the system can get out of order. Is Congress showing the leadership that the times demand? And within this broader context can Congress function at all without a mature responsible opposition that has the staff resources to perform its role as critic and to assume that more than one side of the issue is considered? These are mighty important questions. We are not dealing in petty partisan politics but in issues that affect the course of our democracy.

I want to move now to another issue affecting the basic principles of our democratic way of life and our constitutional system of government.

One of the least dramatic, but most serious problems which has come up during the last two years concerns the very foundation of our ideals of representative government. It affects me personally, and through me it affects the 462,000 residents of Michigan I represent. But as a matter of fact the principle involved affects all members of Congress and all their constituents. I am speaking of a little-publicized idea called "executive privilege." This is how I came up against it several weeks ago:

General Maxwell D. Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was testifying before our defense appropriations subcommittee about the Cuban situation. We were asking him some important and searching questions about the Bay of Pigs invasion -- which might say will be looked on as one of the darkest pages in the history of American foreign policy and a page written exclusively by the Kennedy Administration. Our committee had a right and a need to know how our government handled that mess, for we pass on all the money spent by the Defense Department, and if they don't use it properly, we have the right and responsibility to know so any corrective action can be taken.

I had been disturbed by some news stories which had been appearing just before our meeting with General Taylor which you may remember -- these had to do with what went wrong at the time of the invasion and whether or not the United States ever promised any air cover for the Cuban refugee invaders. I wanted to clear that matter up and to get into some other obvious problems connected with that fiasco which would help our committee decide how to vote when it came time to appropriate money for the Department of Defense and related agencies.

General Taylor was one of the best men in the country to answer these important questions. He had been appointed by President Kennedy to head a four-man board to investigate the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion and find out what went wrong. The investigation was made and the board informed the President what it found out. Then, according to testimony to us and other public statements, the four were told by the President to say nothing about the investigation.

So what happened? Three of the members of the board did follow instructions. Admiral Arleigh Burke, former Chief of Naval Operations did, Allen Dulles, former CIA Chief did, and General Taylor did. But Bobby Kennedy, the fourth member didn't. In one of the classic examples of news management we have seen in this country, Bobby told his version of the invasion to reporters from U.S. News and World Report and the Knight Newspapers. He was in Palm Beach at the time.

Now like all good elephants, we Republicans have long memories. I would like you to recall with me here today some of Mr. Kennedy's own words and compare them with his performance in this very important incident.

First of all, let me read you a section out of the Democratic platform which bears directly on this subject. (Not that the platform makes any difference, you understand, to the Democrats. Its greatest value over the years has been to Republicans who are constantly able to show how hypocritical they are about saying one thing and doing another.) The 1960 platform said: "We reject the Republican contention that the workings of the government are the special private preserve of the Executive. The massive wall of secrecy erected between the Executive Branch and the Congress as well as the citizen, must be torn down. Information must flow freely, save in those areas in which the national security is involved." So on the basis of this strongly worded platform, Senator Kennedy campaigned. As a candidate he gave us lots of words about how under his administration the public would be well

informed and how their representatives in Congress would never be denied information they needed to pass the laws of the land.

At one point he said -- very eloquently, I think -- "The President -- who himself bears much of the responsibility for the preservation of American Democracy -- has the affirmative duty to see to it that the American People are kept fully informed. It is true that in today's world of peril some government information must be kept secret -- information whose publication would endanger the national security. The people of the United States are entitled to the fullest possible information about their government and the President must see that they receive it.

Also on the campaign he referred specifically to executive privilege. He said that whenever information is not restricted by specific statute, security needs, or the Constitution, "there is no justification for using the doctrine of executive privilege to keep that information from the Congress and the public." I hurry to add that in the case of General Taylor's refusal, no specific statute would prohibit him from testifying, no security is involved, and the Constitution gives no justification for his position at all. Continuing down "memory lane," I recall that in his first State of the Union message, Mr. Kennedy made every Congressman's and newspaperman's heart warm with this statement:

"For my part, I shall withhold from neither the Congress nor the people any fact, or report, past, present or future, which is necessary for an informed judgment of our conduct and hazards."

The fact of the matter, from my own personal experience with General Taylor and the Bay of Pigs, is that the President is keeping the Congress and the public in the dark; he is preventing the lawfully elected representatives of the people from making informed judgments of the past conduct of our government and therefore the future hazards which we face. This, I submit, is contrary to everything representative government stands for, to everything we Republicans stand for, and if we can believe their platform -- everything the Democrats themselves stand for.

From the Desk of
THOMAS B. CURTIS
2nd DISTRICT, MISSOURI

For Your Information



But, as Life magazine accurately observes, " . . . they almost all agree that the President's program is wrong. What unites most critics of that program is their feeling that a tax cut must be earned by a corresponding control of expenditures."

Administration spokesmen have said there is no possibility of an overall reduction in Federal spending—that, indeed, it may go up. But thoughtful studies have been made of the budget, and specific areas for heavy cuts, which would not touch the national security, and would not reduce or eliminate any really essential Federal duty or obligation, are delineated.

To take one, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States has a program for a \$9.1 billion cut. Senator PROXMIER thinks that \$2 billion in subsidies can be eliminated. The House Appropriations Committee proposes a reduction of just under \$93 million in funds for the Interior Department alone. And so it goes.

To quote Life again: "The control of unnecessary expenditure is one of the most serious problems facing modern democracy. Government has grown so huge and complex that no individual Congressman can grasp the full dimensions of any budget. But Congress can have a knowledgeable impression of White House budgetmaking, and the current impression is one of carelessness."

And carelessness, of this unbelievably expensive kind, is one thing the Nation simply cannot afford. We aren't that rich.

Activities of Rightwing Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. MCGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, the extremists on the right wing of our political spectrum have been much in the news as of late, perhaps in some relationship to their increased activity in the political arena.

As a representative of a State which apparently has been chosen as a target by the rightwing groups, I have watched their activities with growing concern. These people are dedicated to their ends and unfortunately not too concerned about the methods used to obtain them.

The Rawlins Daily Times published an editorial on May 3 pointing out the vigor of these groups in spite of their small numbers. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Daily Times, Rawlins, Wyo., May 3, 1963]

DON'T COUNT OUT THE RIGHTWINGERS

Militant rightists in this country are not troubled over the argument that they constitute a very small minority of the voting population. They believe, with good reason, that they have a lot going for them.

From the past record, few could doubt that they have ample money resources.

But a rather startling prediction that rightwingers will spend more in 1964 than both major party national committees combined may cast the rightwing effort in a somewhat new light.

The forecast comes from Wesley McCune of Group Research, Inc., an agency that keeps tab on rightist activity.

It is notable, too, that rightwing money evidently is being spent these days with more concentrated effect than before. There are persistent reports that powerful assaults are being leveled against a number of moderate to liberal politicians in the Mountain States—where a dollar may go a long way.

Furthermore, the rightist movement is attracting more prestige leadership than ever in its history. Ezra Taft Benson, former Secretary of Agriculture under Dwight Eisenhower, leads an organization called "Ye, the People." Benson's son, Reed, is active in the John Birch Society in western areas. Retired generals and admirals are joining up in larger numbers.

Rightists often have been concerned over a public image given some of them as "freaks and oddities." In recent months they have managed more and more to dispel this image by gaining audiences among business and professional groups of long standing—farm bureaus, and the like.

Robert Welch, head of the Birch Society, who labels Eisenhower a Communist or a Red dupe, won warm response from a top business club in Chicago.

Nor is the rightwing discouraged by talk it is a fly-by-night thing which took severe licks in 1962 voting and is declining.

Four John Birch candidates for Congress lost in 1962. But two got more than 45 percent of the vote and all got at least 40 percent. If New York's new Conservative Party could duplicate later the 141,000 votes it got for Governor last year, it could decide a close election.

Researcher McCune points out also that aggressive rightist activity did not start with President Kennedy's election in 1960. A whole host of organizations trace their history back to the 1940's and even 1930's. Even Gerald L. K. Smith is still flourishing in the field.

Rightwingers may be on the fringe in terms of relative numbers. But, by a good many other measures, they are right in the thick of the Nation's political combat.

Republican Women Hear Representative Ford Discuss Staffing, Managed News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, late last month, Republican women from throughout the country came to Washington to attend the annual Republican Women's Conference. One of the highlights of this year's conference was the speech by the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the House Republican conference, Mr. FORD. In his speech, the gentleman directed attention to two items of special importance to the group: the inadequacy of minority staffing in Congress and the management of news by the administration.

GERRY FORD made it quite clear that it is the American people who suffer when the Congressional minority is handicapped by inadequate staff help. He called attention to the excellent work of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWEN-

GEL] in leading the effort to bring fair staffing to the Congress.

This speech makes some excellent points and I am taking this opportunity to expand its audience by placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD, REPUBLICAN WOMEN'S CONFERENCE, SHERATON PARK HOTEL, APRIL 26, 1963.

Today I want to discuss two important issues being faced by the Republicans in the House of Representatives. One has to do with minority staffing of committees and the other with the withholding of vital information from the Congress by the executive branch of the Government.

Republicans in the House have moved ahead on several fronts in the early months of this Congress. The Republican conference has been put to new and potentially significant uses. We have appointed a Special Subcommittee on Nuclear Test Ban Negotiations under Congressman CRAIG HOSMER of California, the ranking Republican on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The test ban committee has received position papers from such distinguished experts as Edward Teller, former AEC Chairman Lewis Strauss, and Chief U.S. Disarmament Negotiator William C. Foster—and its reports have been given wide press coverage. We have also set up a Subcommittee on Increased Minority Staffing under Congressman FRED SCHWENKEL, of Iowa.

At the opening of the Congress the conference adopted a package of fair play amendments including a demand for equal time for the minority in debating conference committee reports. We didn't win that fight but we did put the Democratic leadership on notice that the minority was going to play a more active role in the future.

The Republicans on the House Appropriation Committee under a special committee headed by Congressman Bow, of Ohio, have reviewed the President's budget in detail with the assistance of former Budget Director Maurice Stans. The Republicans on Education and Labor and Judiciary have developed alternative Republican proposals in important legislative fields. The House Republican Policy Committee under the able leadership of Congressman JOHN BYRNES of Wisconsin, has been doing an excellent job on the vital issues before us.

Yes, this has been a period of new Republican activity—of hard work in reviewing the Kennedy administration's proposals and in developing Republican alternatives. Our batting average has not been 100 percent but we expect to improve our percentage of success in the months ahead.

One of the most important problems we have tackled is the issue of minority staffing. All the rest of the work we are attempting to accomplish presupposes adequate professionally competent committee staff. There is a limit—a real limit—to how much an individual Congressman or group of Congressmen working in cooperation can accomplish in a given 24-hour period. Each of us has his constituency and its interests to serve. Just keeping abreast of our committee work—preparing for hearings, interrogating witnesses, drafting legislation and reports, handling bills on the floor is a full-time job. And then there are the inevitable social and political obligations of life in the Nation's Capitol as well as in the home district. Time is a Congressman's precious commodity. Staff assistance is essential to us if we are to function effectively.

One of the most serious limitations the Republican minority in Congress has been faced with has been inadequate staff. Last year Roscoe Drummond wrote a series of columns which you may have read dramatizing our position to the Nation. Drummond estimated that we Republicans in the House

were being shortchanged 12 to 1 on committee staff although the Democratic-Republican ratio in House membership was closer to 3 to 2. Some readers misunderstood him to mean that there were 12 Democrats on committee staffs to every Republican. This is not the case—most of our committees have professional staff that have served for many years. Some are Republicans that were hired during the early years of the Eisenhower administration. The point that Drummond was making was that the great bulk of the professional staff on our committees were under the control and responsible to the Democratic majority. This has meant that in too many instances minority views were not being written when bills were reported, that committee investigations were being carried out almost exclusively from the majority point of view. I might add that the worst partisan abuse of the concept of professional nonpartisan staff—as set out in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946—has come on a few committees with large budgets for investigatory staff, such as the Education and Labor Committee. Without minority staff we have not been in a position on certain committees to draft Republican alternatives or to initiate legislation where the administration has faltered.

Because of the central importance of staffing, the Republican Conference unanimously endorsed a proposal by Congressman FRED SCHWENGL of Iowa which would have given the minority 40 percent of the committee staff on committees where the majority of the Republicans were dissatisfied with the staff assistance they were getting. Congressman SCHWENGL is now chairing our Conference Subcommittee on Increased Minority Staffing. He and his committee have been performing yeomen's service in gathering data on the staffing problem, in pressing for more staff at the committee level, in arguing our case before the House Administration Committee which approves all committee budgets, and in planning future strategy in the staffing fight.

Congressman SCHWENGL estimates that we shall have 30 more minority staff members this year than we had in the last Congress, largely as a result of his committee's work. Furthermore the majority leader, CARL ALBERT, as a result of the fight for more minority staff has pledged his party to eliminate partisan abuse in staffing and to abide by the spirit of the Reorganization Act. We intend to hold him to his word.

On the Senate side our big guns have begun to swing into action although I might add after our foot soldiers launched the offensive. We welcome their assistance. You may have seen Senator GOLDWATER's column a few Sundays ago. Senator GOLDWATER said that:

"Insufficient minority staffing makes legislation more dependent than ever upon the statistics, the witnesses, the proposals of the Democratic administration as transmitted through the majority. I would make this point just as emphatically if the situation were reversed and the proper committee staffing denied to the Democrats. The need is for proper policies, properly researched, properly arrived at and understood above and beyond the desires of the particular administration running the executive branch."

Senator DIRKSEN has recently urged all ranking minority members on the standing committees of the Senate to press for more staff assistance to service the needs of the minority.

I have been discussing the problem of minority staff but this is only a part of a much larger problem that the staffing fight has dramatically illustrated. The Congress at large just does not have the staff resources it needs if it is to perform its proper role in our constitutional system. We have seen the gradual and continuing erosion of

power from the legislative to the executive in the past 30 years. One of the major intents of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 was to reestablish balance to provide Congress with professional staff for its legislative committees. This was a real gain for effective congressional government but we have not kept pace with the times. There are numerous specific examples in both the House and Senate right today and the country is the loser because of this deficiency.

Most Members of Congress would agree on how crucial the staffing issue is not only to a vigorous and constructive opposition but also for the survival of Congress as a meaningful participant in our processes of government.

A good part of the minority staffing problem would be solved with the correction of this broader problem. There is a clear need for a selective increase in the professional nonpartisan staff of the committees in areas of deficiency such as I have just noted. Ultimately we may be moving toward the kind of staffing arrangement that Congressman TOM CURTIS has suggested—a "three-part staff" with the bulk of the staff professional and nonpartisan (i.e., available to all Members regardless of party affiliation) with a few staff members, also professional qualified, under the direct control of the majority and minority respectively—for the purpose of drafting majority and minority reports and assisting the Members on issues of a more immediate party political nature.

What, you ask, can I or my club do to help solve these problems? You can help by writing your Congressmen and Senators be they Democrat or Republican and asking them how they stand on the staffing issue. Congressmen don't vote by weighing their mail but they will certainly sit up and take notice of an issue on which they receive intelligent letters. Particularly in a case such as this where we are discussing a problem peculiar to Congress, its methods of operation, and its public image. Congressmen are especially sensitive to the views and judgments of their constituents. Write and ask your Congressman if he feels that Congress is meeting its responsibilities in reviewing and considering executive proposals for new spending and legislation. Is Congress adequately overseeing the executive agencies? The Billie Sol Estes case is only one example—albeit an extreme one—of how the system can get out of order. Is Congress showing the leadership that the times demand? And within this broader context can Congress function at all without a mature responsible opposition that has the staff resources to perform its role as critic and to assume that more than one side of the issue is considered? These are mighty important questions. We are not dealing in petty partisan politics but in issues that affect the course of our democracy.

I want to move now to another issue affecting the basic principles of our democratic way of life and our constitutional system of government.

One of the least dramatic, but most serious, problems which has come up during the last 2 years concerns the very foundation of our ideals of representative government. It affects me personally, and through me it affects the 462,000 residents of Michigan I represent. But as a matter of fact the principle involved affects all Members of Congress and all their constituents. I am speaking of a little publicized idea called "executive privilege." This is how I came up against it several weeks ago:

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was testifying before our defense appropriations subcommittee about the Cuban situation. We were asking him some important and searching questions about the Bay of Pigs invasion—which I might say will be looked on as one of the

darkest pages in the history of American foreign policy and a page written exclusively by the Kennedy administration. Our committee had a right and a need to know how our Government handled that mess, for we pass on all the money spent by the Defense Department and, if they don't use it properly, we have the right and responsibility to know so any corrective action can be taken.

I had been disturbed by some news stories which had been appearing just before our meeting with General Taylor which you may remember—these had to do with what went wrong at the time of the invasion and whether or not the United States ever promised any air cover for the Cuban refugee invaders. I wanted to clear that matter up and to get into some other obvious problems connected with that fiasco which would help our committee decide how to vote when it came time to appropriate money for the Department of Defense and related agencies.

General Taylor was one of the best men in the country to answer these important questions. He had been appointed by President Kennedy to head a four-man board to investigate the ill-fated Bay-of-Pigs invasion and find out what went wrong. The investigation was made and the board informed the President what it found out. Then, according to testimony to us and other public statements, the four were told by the President to say nothing about the investigation.

So what happened? Three of the members of the board did follow instructions. Adm. Arleigh Burke, former Chief of Naval Operations did, Allen Dulles, former CIA Chief did, and General Taylor did. But Bobby Kennedy, the fourth member didn't. In one of the classic examples of news management we have seen in this country, Bobby told his version of the invasion to reporters from U.S. News and World Report and the Knight newspapers. He was in Palm Beach at the time.

Now like all good elephants, we Republicans have long memories. I would like you to recall with me here today some of Mr. Kennedy's own words and compare them with his performance in this very important incident.

First of all, let me read you a section out of the Democratic platform which bears directly on this subject. (Not that the platform makes any difference, you understand, to the Democrats. Its greatest value over the years have been to Republicans who are constantly able to show how hypocritical they are about saying one thing and doing another.) The 1960 platform said: "We reject the Republican contention that the workings of the Government are the special private preserve of the Executive. The massive wall of secrecy erected between the executive branch and the Congress as well as the citizen, must be torn down. Information must flow freely, save in those areas in which the national security is involved." So on the basis of this strongly worded platform, Senator Kennedy campaigned. As a candidate he gave us lots of words about how under his administration the public would be well informed and how their Representatives in Congress would never be denied information they needed to pass the laws of the land.

At one point he said—very eloquently, I think: "The President—who himself bears much of the responsibility for the preservation of American democracy—has the affirmative duty to see to it that the American people are kept fully informed. It is true that in today's world of peril some Government information must be kept secret—information whose publication would endanger the national security. The people of the United States are entitled to the fullest possible information about their Government and the President must see that they receive it."

Also on the campaign he referred specifically to Executive privilege. He said that whenever information is not restricted by specific statute, security needs, or the Constitution, "there is no justification for using the doctrine of Executive privilege to keep information from the Congress and the public." I hurry to add that, in the case of General Taylor's refusal, no specific statute would prohibit him from testifying, no security is involved, and the Constitution gives no justification for his position at all. Continuing down "memory lane," I recall that in his first state of the Union message Mr. Kennedy made every Congressman's and newspaperman's heart warm with this statement:

"For my part, I shall withhold from neither the Congress nor the people any fact, or report—past, present, or future—which is necessary for any informed judgment of our conduct and hazards."

The fact of the matter, from my own personal experience with General Taylor and the Bay of Pigs, is that the President is keeping the Congress and the public in the dark; he is preventing the lawfully elected representatives of the people from making informed judgments of the past conduct of our Government and therefore the future hazards which we face. This, I submit, is contrary to everything representative government stands for, to everything we Republicans stand for and, if we can believe their platform, everything the Democrats themselves stand for.

Mrs. Ungar, World Traveler, Gives Her Impression of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I have consistently voted against the huge appropriations for foreign aid since the end of the shooting war.

The record shows that I have been on the losing side; that this country has lavished a hundred billion dollars on friends and erstwhile friends all over the globe, notwithstanding what I consider clear evidence that the gain achieved by these expenditures is not nearly so positive as the condition of our Treasury is negative.

I will not belabor you at this time with my own often-expressed views gathered on personal trips to foreign-aid countries. But I would like to have printed in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from a letter written to the Council Bluffs (Iowa) Nonpareil by a constituent of mine, Mrs. Alice Ungar of Council Bluffs.

Mrs. Ungar, accompanied by her husband Leo, has just returned from a 75-day air trip around the world. This is just another in a series of trips this perceptive couple has made. I mention this so that the House will know they are experienced travelers, ones who have visited and revisited many lands and thus have been able to make comparisons.

Periodically during their globe-girdling trip, Mrs. Ungar wrote a chatty and in-

formative letter back to the Nonpareil so readers and neighbors could learn of their progress and their observations. I was pleased to read comments about places and experiences that matched my own recollections about some places.

Thus, I feel I am dutybound to share with all the views Mrs. Ungar included in her final letter, after making an east to west trip through Japan, Taiwan, Hong Kong, southeast Asia, India, Iran, Turkey, Austria, Italy, and Spain.

It is significant to note that the Ungars were in the Far East when the Clay Commission report on foreign aid came out; yet, in her direct and to-the-point critique on the present value of foreign aid, Alice Ungar states in a few words the essential conclusions covered in thousands of words by that illuminating document.

Mrs. Ungar's letter excerpt follows:

In the April 22 international issue of Life magazine we read that American aid to 116 foreign countries would pass the \$100 billion mark this year.

In only two countries we have visited—Turkey and Spain—have we heard our aid acknowledged. Our money has been spent in accordance with the point 4 policy; that is, everyone in the world should have healthy living conditions, be educated, live in freedom and be provided with the opportunity to work.

Each country we visited was clean and prosperous, and thousands of apartment houses and new buildings were everywhere. In Hong Kong real estate values were as high as New York City. In Thailand the newspapers pointed out they did not want foreign help or military entanglements. They prefer to help themselves.

In India, we remember a traffic tieup that lasted 2 hours because 6 Indians lay down in the middle of the street and pretended they were dead. They had been notified the slum area in which they lived was to be razed, and they were protesting.

In Vienna, the city is still building spacious housing units for factory workers although they now have 170,000 such flats. The oldest of these may be rented for \$4 to \$8 a month.

We saw no suburban shopping centers. Old areas in the cities were being torn down and rebuilt. As a result, all the cities we saw were beautiful, and their property values had increased a hundredfold.

In each place I have visited, I have thought of the city in which I live and which I love and I think it is time to stop sending help abroad.

It is time, and past, to do something about our own streets and housing needs and industrial development. I think it is time to turn the fruit of our work to our own benefit, where we can see and enjoy and appreciate the results.

Arthur Hoppe's Columns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, now that Art Hoppe has hopped back to California after visiting Washington and other geographical points of interest, I

wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD several of his recent columns which I am sure will delight his followers:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle,
Apr. 23, 1963]

EYEBALL TO EYEBALL WITH BIRTH CONTROL (By Arthur Hoppe)

I'm sorry, I mentioned the other day that Mr. and Mrs. Kennedy had separate bedrooms merely to point out that the richer you get, the farther away from your wife you get. And the fewer children you have. I noted that this was geographical birth control—"the only system," I said flatly, "that really worked."

So Mr. Kennedy promptly announced he was going off Europe in June. Great. And then Mrs. Kennedy announced she was—

Well, it's all my fault. I suppose I should've given more detailed instructions. But that's the whole trouble with all our present complex methods. They require precise directions which you've got to follow to the letter. And in the proper sequence. Or else. Which is why love often conquers all.

But our scientists, thank goodness, are working on it. And I'm deliriously happy to learn that Dr. Carl G. Heller, who's what is called "a reproductive physiologist" at the Pacific Northwest Research Foundation, has made a smashing technological breakthrough. He's come up with a pill for gentlemen that's cheap, safe, harmless to your maleness and guaranteed absolutely 100 percent effective. It even tastes good. In fact, says Dr. Heller, tests show it's got only one teensy little drawback:

If you take a single drink while on the pills, your eyeballs turn bright red.

Thus his new pills, the good doctor told the American Chemical Society sadly, "probably would not be acceptable to men in the Western World." And back he went to the old drawing board.

Nonsense. Here we are, faced with a population explosion and our faint-hearted scientists are willing to scrap our salvation. All because of one tiny little flaw. Shades of Thomas Alva Edison. Is this what made America great? No.

I say we've got to get out there and sell. For example, we could sell men on the idea of giving up drinking because * * *. Well, we could at least sell them on wearing dark work wouldn't cure. Ads: "Are your eyeballs pale, tired, colorless?" Drinks: "The new red eye highball." Contests: "Mr. red-blooded American eyeball."

Actually, when you stop to think about it, there's nothing inherently wrong with red eyeballs. Not that a little good promotion work wouldn't cure. Ads: "Are Your Eyeballs Pale, Tired, Colorless?" Drinks: "The New Red Eye Highball." Contests: "Mr. Red-Blooded American Eyeball."

Of course, the ladies would take a bit of convincing. You know how they are. We might start by planting a few pointed articles in the ladies' magazines. Such as True Confessions: "There we were, eyeball to eyeball—and his were white."

Eventually, I'm sure, we'd convince them of the undeniable advantages of such a method. I mean there you are, an attractive young lady. You walk into a cocktail party crowded with handsome young bachelors. Half have red eyeballs, half don't. Which * * *. Well, I don't want to go into details. But we'd soon separate the ladies from the girls. And most bachelors will, I know, agree that's an undeniable advantage right there.

Oh, I can hear you saying you don't care. You still don't like red eyeballs. Well let me tell you this is no time for petty aesthetic prejudices. All present methods require diligence or sacrifice. Join your local red eye-