<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roll Call</th>
<th>Measure: Proposal</th>
<th>Percentage of Deviation</th>
<th>Votes to Win Rep. Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>H. J. Res. 234: To recommit in order to stop shipment of certain surplus farm commodities to Col. Nasser of Egypt. (Passed 204-177)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>H.J. Res. 234: To insist on House provisions relative to shipment of farm products to Col. Nasser. (Defeated 161-241)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>H. Res. 188: To recommit resolution providing funds for Committee on Un-American Activities in order to hold hearings on justification. (Defeated 58-332)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>H. Res 188: To provide $370,000 for operating Committee on Un-American Activities. (Passed 359-29)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>H. R. 980: To make it more difficult to send obscene material thru mails. (Passed 360-21)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>H. R. 6675: To recommit Social Security bill in order to substitute Republican proposal for &quot;Medicare.&quot; (Defeated 191-236)</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>H. R. 7750: To recommit foreign aid authorization to cut cost and to restrict activities of communist-dominated labor unions in connection with housing projects receiving our aid in Latin America. (Defeated 178-219)</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>H. R. 8370: To recommit Agriculture appropriation bill to restrict exportation of certain surplus farm products to United Arab Republic and Indonesia. (Defeated 187-208)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>H. R. 8775: To recommit legislative appropriation bill to delete $85,000 for employment of 16 operators to run automatic elevators. (Defeated 149-264)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>H.Con. Res. 283: To amend resolution on showing of USIA film on Pres. Kennedy in U.S. to provide that no fee shall be charged. (Defeated 174-216)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>H. R. 6927: To substitute an &quot;Office of Urban Affairs&quot; in Executive Office in place of new cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development. (Defeated 141-259)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>H. R. 6927: To approve bill establishing new Dept. of Housing and Urban Development. (Passed 217-184)</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>H.J. Res. 541: To extend Area Redevelopment Act for two months. (Passed 224-167)</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>H.R. 7984: To delete section on &quot;rent supplements&quot; from Housing bill. (Defeated 202-208)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>H.R. 7984: On final passage of Housing bill. (Passed 245-169)</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>H.R. 6600: On the &quot;honest elections&quot; amendment to Voting Rights bill. (Passed 253-165)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll Call</td>
<td>Measure Proposal</td>
<td>Percentage of Deviation</td>
<td>Votes to Win Rep. Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>H. R. 6400: To adopt the Boggs Amendment weakening the voting rights bill by making it inoperative in counties where only at least 50% of Negroes are registered. (Defeated 155-262)</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>102.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>H.R. 6400: An amendment to permit those illiterate in English to vote if had completed 6th grade in Spanish-language schools. (Defeated 202-216)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>H.R. 6400: To substitute McCulloch-Ford voting rights bill for H.R. 6400. (Defeated 171-248)</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>H.R. 8283: To recommit Poverty bill to keep Governor's veto and to reduce 1966 authorization to an amount equal to that for 1965. (Defeated 178-227)</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>H.R. 77: To recommit bill to repeal Section 14b of Taft Hartley. (Defeated 200-223)</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>H.R. 77: To repeal Sec. 14b of Taft Hartley (Passed 221-203)</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>S.1648: To amend to make more areas eligible for grants under the Public Works and Economic Development Act and to increase the authorization. (Passed 196-194)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>S.1648: To recommit Public Works and Economic Development Act in order to reduce cost by $85 million and require annual review of expenditure by Congress. (Defeated 163-226)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>H.R. 9811: To recommit omnibus farm bill. (Defeated 169-224)</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>H.R. 9811: To pass omnibus farm bill. (Passed 221-172)</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>H.R. 2580: To amend the immigration bill to include a limitation on immigration from the western hemisphere. (Defeated 189-218)</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>H.R. 8283: To recommit anti-poverty bill to conference in order to insist on House position on governor's veto. (Passed 209-180)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>H. Res 574: To kill the resolution asking Postmaster General to provide names of summer postal employees. (Passed 186-180)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On these 29 significant votes: thru September 24

Average deviation
Republican 6.7 percent
Democrat 23.0 percent

Vote changes needed to obtain Republican victory:
Average: 24

Number of instances where 30 or more votes needed: 6
Number of instances requiring less than 30 votes: 15
Number of instances in which Rep. views prevailed: 8
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roll Call</th>
<th>Measure; Proposal</th>
<th>Percentage of Deviation</th>
<th>Votes to Win Rep. Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>H. J. Res. 234: To recommit in order to stop shipment of certain surplus farm commodities to Col. Nasser of Egypt. (Passed 204-177)</td>
<td>0. 30.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>H.J. Res. 234: To insist on House provisions relative to shipment of farm products to Col. Nasser. (Defeated 161-242)</td>
<td>7.7 13.4</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>H. Res. 188: To recommit resolution providing funds for Committee on Un-American Activities in order to hold hearings on justification. (Defeated 58-332)</td>
<td>0.7 17.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>H. Res 188: To provide $370,000 for operating Committee on Un-American Activities. (Passed 359-29)</td>
<td>0. 11.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>H. R. 980: To make it more difficult to send obscene material thru mails. (Passed 360-21)</td>
<td>1.6 7.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>H. R. 6675: To recommit Social Security bill in order to substitute Republican proposal for &quot;Medicare.&quot; (Defeated 191-236)</td>
<td>7.2 21.8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>H. R. 7750: To recommit foreign aid authorization to cut cost and to restrict activities of communist-dominated labor unions in connection with housing projects receiving our aid in Latin America. (Defeated 178-219)</td>
<td>18.7 23.2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>H. R. 8370: To recommit Agriculture appropriation bill to restrict exportation of certain surplus farm products to United Arab Republic and Indonesia. (Defeated 187-208)</td>
<td>1.6 23.4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>H. R. 8775: To recommit legislative appropriation bill to delete $35,000 for employment of 16 operators to run automatic elevators. (Defeated 169-245)</td>
<td>7.7 7.9</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>H.Con. Res. 285: To amend resolution on showing of IBM film on Pres. Kennedy in U.S. to provide that no fee shall be charged. (Defeated 174-216)</td>
<td>0. 18.5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>H. R. 6927: To substitute an &quot;Office of Urban Affairs&quot; in Executive Office in place of new cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development. (Defeated 161-259)</td>
<td>3.9 6.9</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>H. R. 6927: To approve bill establishing new Dept. of Housing and Urban Development. (Passed 217-180)</td>
<td>7.1 22.1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>H.J. Res. 341: To extend Area Redevelopment Act for two months. (Passed 224-167)</td>
<td>12.1 19.7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>H.R. 7984: To delete section on &quot;rent supplements&quot; from Housing bill. (Defeated 202-208)</td>
<td>2.9 26.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>H.R. 7984: On final passage of Housing bill. (Passed 245-169)</td>
<td>19.3 21.5</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>H.R. 6400: On the &quot;honest elections&quot; amendment to Voting Rights bill. (Passed 253-165)</td>
<td>0. 41.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Roll Call | Measure Proposal | Percentage of Deviation | Votes to Win Rep. Position
---|---|---|---
176 | H. R. 6400: To adopt the Boggs Amendment weakening the voting rights bill by making it inoperative in counties where only at least 50% of Negroes are registered. | 13.2 | 0
177 | H.R. 6400: An amendment to permit those illiterate in English to vote if had completed 5th grade in Spanish-language schools. | 7.4 | 0
178 | H. R. 6400: To substitute McCulloch-Ford voting rights bill for H.R. 6400. | 15.4 | 39
196 | H.R. 8283: To recommit Poverty bill to keep Governor's veto and to reduce 1966 authorization to an amount equal to that for 1965. | 9.7 | 25
208 | H.R. 77: To recommit bill to repeal Section 14b of Taft Hartley. | 13.7 | 12
209 | H.R. 77: To repeal Sec. 14b of Taft Hartley | 15.2 | 10
234 | S.1648: To amend to make more areas eligible for grants under the Public Works and Economic Development Act and to increase the authorization. | 7 | 2
235 | S.1648: To recommit Public Works and Economic Development Act in order to reduce cost by $85 million and require annual review of expenditure by Congress. | 8 | 31
243 | H.R. 9811: To recommit omnibus farm bill. | 11.3 | 28
244 | H.R. 9811: To pass omnibus farm bill. | 15.4 | 25
248 | H.R. 2580: To amend the immigration bill to include a limitation on immigration from the western hemisphere. | 9.7 | 15
299 | H.R. 8283: To recommit anti-poverty bill to conference in order to insist on House position on governor's veto. | 0 | 0
303 | H. Res 574: To kill the resolution asking Postmaster General to provide names of summer postal employees. | 0 | 4

On these 29 significant votes: thru September 24

Average deviation
Republican 6.7 percent
Democrat 23.0 percent

Vote changes needed to obtain Republican victory:
Average: 24
Number of instances where 30 or more votes needed: 6
Number of instances requiring less than 30 votes: 15
Number of instances in which Rep. views prevailed: 8
15 Republicans Underscore Support For Administration's Policy in Southeast Asia

15 Republican Congressmen, in a letter issued yesterday, underscored Republican support of President Johnson's policy in Southeast Asia. In a letter to House Republican Leader Gerald Ford, the 15 Congressmen pointed to the unanimous Republican support in both Houses of Congress for the President's request for an additional $700 million earmarked for Vietnam. The joint effort mentioned the Republican Party's "continuing dedication to its uninterrupted history of bipartisan support for United States policy in times of crisis."

The letter to Ford reminded "all those abroad who may hope that internal differences will sap American will and purpose in Vietnam, the unanimous Republican support of the President should make clear just how wrong they are," and that the Republican Party, despite differences with President Johnson, stands together in the determination to preserve the integrity of South Vietnam and the right of her people to be free.

/s/ Alphonzo Bell, Calif.  /s/ F. Bradford Morse, Calif.
/s/ William S. Broomfield, Mich.  /s/ Charles A. Mosher, Ohio
/s/ Robert F. Ellsworth, Kan.  /s/ Howard W. Robison, N.Y.
/s/ Frank J. Horton, N.Y.  /s/ Garner E. Shriver, Kan.

Text of Letter Follows
From the Offices of: Robert F. Ellsworth, 3rd, Kansas
Peter H.B. Frelinghuysen, 5th, New Jersey

FOR RELEASE THURSDAY A.M.'s

MAY 13, 1965 PAGE TWO

The Honorable Gerald Ford
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

Dear Jerry:

We take great pride in the unanimous Republican vote in both Houses of the Congress in support of the President's request for $700 million for U.S. policy in Vietnam. The message should be crystal clear:

-- To President Johnson, Republican unanimity spoke of our Party's continuing dedication to its uninterrupted history of bipartisan support for United States policy in times of crisis.

-- To all those abroad who may hope that internal differences will sap American will and purpose in Vietnam, the unanimous Republican support of the President should make clear just how wrong they are.

-- And to those few here at home who demonstrate against the American presence in Vietnam the Republican Party has made clear that, whatever our differences with President Johnson, we stand together in the determination to preserve the integrity of South Vietnam and the right of her people to be free.

Republicans of course will jealously guard our right to disagree with the President and to criticize him publicly when he is wrong. We do not for one moment suggest that we agree fully with all phases of American policy or its implementation, even in Vietnam. But all people everywhere should have no doubt where we stand on the fundamental precepts of American policy in Southeast Asia:

1. We believe that the United States forces should remain in South Vietnam as long as the Communist aggression continues.

2. We believe that the United States cannot in good conscience abandon the Asian continent to Communist imperialist domination and that an American withdrawal from Vietnam in the present circumstances would undermine confidence in American leadership and encourage further tests of our will.

3. We believe that the limited air attacks against North Vietnam are justified because they require the North Vietnamese regime to pay a heavy price for the aggression it is waging, because they may impel the North Vietnamese to seek a negotiated settlement, and because they may limit the effectiveness of the Viet Cong in South Vietnam.

We believe that the surest road to peace and to constructive negotiations, in Vietnam and around the world, must inevitably begin with the willingness to meet aggression whenever and wherever it occurs.

The only purpose of force is to secure a just peace. We share the President's reluctance to use forces in Vietnam, but we share also his determination to persevere in the search for a just peace.

Sincerely,
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.

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 act on this important change of policy with only two hours of debate and that no opportunity be given to offer meaningful amendments.

If the House is not to sacrifice its self-respect, it will vote down the proposal that it shut its mouth, plug its ears, close its eyes and swallow the Johnson 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 typical type of log-rolling on the 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 ruthlessly trying to put together is successful, how can Congress be considered to act as an independent branch of government?
STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

A strange thing happened to the proposed constitutional amendment on apportionment of State legislators 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 on the other hand, conclude that mechanical adherence to the "one man, one vote" principle should be imposed on both branches of the legislature of every state by Federal fiat regardless of the 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. 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 exclude 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: Shall we allow the people to make the decision about the basis of representation in one house of their own legislature, or shall we impose a decision on them whether they want it or not? We propose to 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.
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.

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 act on this important change of policy with only two hours of debate and that no opportunity be given to offer meaningful amendments.

If the House is not to sacrifice its self-respect, it will vote down the proposal that it shut its mouth, plug its ears, close its eyes and swallow the Johnson 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 the 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 ruthlessly trying to put together is successful, how can Congress be considered to act as an independent branch of government?

(Dirkson statement - page 2)
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 or 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 on the other hand, conclude that mechanical adherence to the "one man, one vote" principle should be imposed on both branches of the legislature of every state by Federal fiat regardless of the 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. 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 exclude 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: Shall we allow the people to make the decision about the basis of representation in one house of their state legislature, or shall we impose a decision on them whether they want it or not? We propose to 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.
WASHINGTON, September 22.—Senator MANSFIELD, the majority leader, is about to demonstrate once more that when he says something should be done he means to follow through. Recently he proposed that the next session of the 89th Congress “spend less time on new legislation and more time correcting oversights in legislation we have just passed.” Today, reached by telephone in his home State of Montana, he described the practical steps with which he plans to give effect to his proposal.

“I intend to submit it for action at a Democratic Senate conference before adjournment,” he said. “We have passed a lot of major bills at this session, some of them very hastily, and they stand in extreme need of a going-over for loopholes, rough corners, and particularly for an assessment of current and ultimate cost in the framework of our capacity to meet it.”

OVERSEEING SUBCOMMITTEES

“In reminding the conference of this, I plan to ask for the creation of overseeing subcommittees among whose functions it would be to tighten up the hasty enactments in general and to evaluate the degree of efficiency with which they are being administered by the executive.”

The plan seems marked for resistance in the Democratic Senate conference, despite its urgent necessity. And pressure against it may be expected from House Democrats also. For the next session will occur in the year of the general congressional elections. And Democrats from States and districts where the 1964 landslide broke a long pattern of electing Republicans will in all likelihood prefer to postpone the risk inherent in such a reexamination and appraisal. Fearful Democratic candidates for reelection conceivably will even include some who sought to stem the legislative onrush of the President and the party majority toward the welfare state goal of the Great Society.

In this event the President’s active support of MANSFIELD’s highly constructive program may be required. And, although he can sense a political liability as keenly as any politician in the American past or present, he is also alert to the hazard in exposing it as the unmistakable motive for the rejection of a plan so obviously in the public interest. And that interest is implicit in a simple catalog of the measures he drove through this session of Congress.

Moreover, Vice President HUMPHREY may not have been speaking entirely on his own, if he has been accurately reported as believing “the huge legislative tonnage dropped on our doorstep” should undergo the management analysis to which Defense Secretary McNamara subjects all military programs. And this is precisely what Senator MANSFIELD intends to propose to the Democratic Senate conference.

“TONNAGE” LISTED

This “tonnage” already consists of the following on which action has been completed: medical care; financial help for Appalachia; the financing of regional development; elementary-secondary education; omnibus public housing; a new department of housing; reduced excise taxes, and foreign aid. Nearling final enactment are financing programs for higher education, depollution of the waters, a supplemental antipoverty law, a national arts foundation, and omnibus farm subsidies legislation.

To this partial list of Federal undertakings at undetermined costs and wholly speculative effects on the socioeconomy administration pressure is now being exerted for a health conservation program more revolutionary than medicare and even more speculative as to cost. This calls for the establishment of a network of at least 1,350 diagnostic and treatment centers for heart disease, cancer, and stroke. A host of surgical teams and other hospital specialists would be paid for by grants from the Federal Government.
The latest report is that this is the last of the "observation" copies - please distribute with discretion.

The Congress will come to have the same importance in the American system of government as the House of Lords has in Great Britain, particularly if several future Presidents resemble Lyndon Johnson. Bob Sevareid wrote:

"We know of a number of Congressmen who would be very grateful to learn what they have really done this year."

He also found that the Congress has so often acted under "a curious kind of intimidation" that the "one-armed title of Senator or Representative has lost much of its prestige."

One of the leading newspapers in the home State of the Vice President summed it up this way:

"Anybody following the daily deliberations of the House of Representatives must be struck by the ruthlessness with which the Democratic majority of so-called liberals is flexing its muscles. It is not, in fact, a deliberative body. Representative government is in a sad state."

Columnist Ted Lewis said:

"The presidential image of a miracle producer of new laws makes the legislative branch of Government appear to be a creature of the executive branch."

The Chicago Tribune, in an editorial entitled "Legislating by Scoop Shovel," said:

"It would take a truck scale to weigh the legislation forwarded by the White House and automatically approved, most of it worthless, much of it unnecessary, and all of it putting the individual in the grip of the Federal vice."

Mr. [The President] has been legislating everything and anything, and, with two-thirds majorities in either House, he has a Congress of robots that is totally compliant."

The Knoxville Journal editorialized:

"Any Congress which voluntarily yields its right to perform as a coequal part of the Federal Establishment, as this one has, is a continuing threat to the Nation."

The Education and Labor Committee made virtually no change in the administration bill to provide assistance for elementary and secondary education, despite vigorous bipartisan complaints about the formula for distributing Federal funds contained in the bill. On the floor, at least 10 of 25 amendments were rejected without discussion due to the one-rule limitation on debate.

As this far-reaching legislation was being considered by the House of Representatives, Democratic Congresswoman...
Observations on the 1st Session of 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. GERALD R. FORD
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the record of the 1st session of the 89th Congress is spotless. Along with the enactment of some meritorious and needed legislation, the Congress often acted hastily, blindly, and indiscriminately.

The majority leader of the Senate, Mr. Mansfield, of Montana, has confessed serious deficiencies in the laws enacted by the Congress this year. He has announced that the 2d 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 that the Congress "must tighten up the hasty enactments" and must eliminate from the laws of the session just ended "a number of gaps and any number of rough edges, overreaches and overlaps."

The Mansfield confession should be good for the soul of the American people. It should convince them that one-party government does not serve them well.

One conclusion to be drawn from the 1st session of the 89th Congress is that whenever the party that holds possession of the executive branch of the National Government also enjoys overwhelming dominance in the Congress, the Congress becomes a satellite of the President.

The failure of the Congress to act as a deliberative body, coequal with the Executive, is the most striking feature of this past session. Until the closing days of the session, it rubberstamped the proposals of the White House in far too many instances.

The members of the American Political Science Association who gathered in Washington in early September of this year felt that the legislative initiative has passed irretrievably to the executive branch. One of the experts at that convention, Lewis A. Dexter, said that the Congress will come to have the same importance in the American system of government as the House of Lords had in the British, particularly if several future Presidents resemble Lyndon Johnson.

One conclusion to be drawn from the 1st session of the 89th Congress is that whenever the party that holds possession of the executive branch of the National Government also enjoys overwhelming dominance in the Congress, Congress comes to act as a deliberative body, coequal with the President.

Representative government is in a critical state. The presidential image of a miracle producer of new laws makes the legislative branch of Government appear to be a creature of the executive branch.

Columnist Ted Lewis said: "The presidential image of a miracle producer of new laws makes the legislative branch of Government appear to be a creature of the executive branch.

The Chicago Tribune, in an editorial entitled "Legisla ting by Scoop Shovel," said: "It would take a truck scale to weigh the legislation forwarded by the White House and automatically approved, most of it wasteful, much of it unnecessary, and all of it putting the country in the grip of the Federal tax.

The President has been legislating everything and anything, and, with two-thirds majorities in either chamber, he has a Congress of robots that is totally compliant."

The Knoxville Journal editorialized: "Any Congress which voluntarily yields its right to perform as a coequal part of the Federal Establishment, as this one has, is a continuing threat to the Nation."

It is one thing for a Congress to adopt Presidential proposals after thorough deliberation and adequate discussion. It is quite another thing for a Congress to rush through such proposals without careful scrutiny and without reasonable debate. No Congress that performed its constitutional duty would do the slipshod job of which Senator Mansfield indicted the present Congress when he said that it must now devote most of its effort to tightening up "its hasty enactments."

EXAMPLES OF RUBBERSTAMPING BY THE CONGRESS

On many important bills the House of Representatives acted without adequate consideration, without full hearings in committee, and without sufficient debate on the floor.

The arts and humanities bill was railroaded through the Committee on Education and Labor after about 15 minutes of consideration. Even a motion by the minority that the bill be read was summarily rejected by the majority. When the committee met to act on the bill, the members were present for the first time with a new committee print, dated the same day, containing a number of significant amendments which the minority members had never seen before. Thereafter, several additional amendments, which the Republican members had never seen, were quickly adopted in committee, and the bill was reported with great haste.

The Education and Labor Committee made virtually no change in the administration bill to provide assistance for elementary and secondary education, despite vigorous bipartisan complaints about the formula for distributing Federal funds contained in the bill. On the floor, at least 10 of 25 amendments were rejected without discussion due to the gag-rule limitation on debate.

As this far-reaching legislation was being considered by the House of Representatives, Democratic Congressional leader

Washington in many instances.
Congress, of course, took the floor to protest. Quote, 'as far as we are concerned, as far as the House, a determined effort to silence those who dare to express an independent viewpoint.' So little was the elementary and secondary education bill studied before floor action that those members who supported the measure, gave to the House floor action only the appearances of its application to nonpublic schools.

The higher education bill was reported out of the Ways and Means Committee in huge haste, apparently at the command of the White House. The Wall Street Journal noted that the committee 'under prodding from an impatient White House deliberated for all of 20 minutes.' Democratic Congressman Provenor, of Illinois, called the bill's action 'a mockery of the legislative process.'

Heard on the administration's original highway beautification proposals were held by the Committee on Public Works. On July 30, 21, and 22, these hearings were adjourned with the understanding that the complex proposals should be studied further and acted upon early next year.

Regarding the very controversial bill to repeal the poll tax, the committee heard the administration and other proposals with the final vote being 84 to allow but 8 minutes of debate on 5 separate amendments. The defects in the legislation enacted in 1964 will come to light as the bills are ended will come to light as the bills are passed in this Congress.

The administration bill required Federal approval of any exemption from using union funds for political purposes. The subcommittee, meetings which reported the bill favorably. An hour later the full committee met and reported the bill to the House. No amendments were offered because none of the minority members had any opportunity to study the long and complex measure and analyze even the theoretical weaknesses. This bill will not be acted on by the House.

The House, the administration forces on the Judiciary Committee methodically rejected all significant amendments offered by Republicans and the majority of the Committee on Education and Labor rejects all significant amendments. Democrats amend the bill as to provide some basic protections for race-and-disability-eligible candidates, in order to uphold their jobs. Because of the resulting pressure, the education bill was considered by the House, amendments which would permit compulsory membership agreements only if the unions involved refused from refunding and re-employment from using union funds for political purposes. A representative of the American Bar Association testified on the bill, the field of highway construction and public health.

The public works and reenrollment bill, providing for aid to so-called depressed areas, overlaps the Appalachian bill.

In summary, the Elementary and Secondary School Aid bill, which is ostensibly aimed at children from low-income families, as well as vocational education and public works programs.
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Third, by utilizing existing privately owned rental housing for low-income tenants;

Fourth, by lower interest rates on loans for college housing and housing for the elderly;

Fifth, by providing new FHA mortgage financing for veterans.

Many of the features of the Goodwin bill were incorporated in the measure which was enacted.
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Community issued a thoughtful report on means of strengthening the Atlantic Alliance and improving the strained relations of the United States with France after a study trip to Paris.

Representative CHARLES CORBETT, of Minnesota, along with Representative RALPH HARRIS, of Indiana, also took the lead in an unsuccessful fight against the administration on the sugar bill in an effort to recoup for the United States its share of the excess profit which foreign sugar producers derive from sales in this country because Government action maintains a domestic price more than double the world market.

Representative ROBERT J. CONNETT, of Pennsylvania, fought unsuccessfully to bring about an adjustment of the pay of Federal employees to provide full comparability with pay scales in private industry. Though full comparability is given lip service by the administration, it is opposed to putting this principle into practice.

Representative ANCHEN NEZLER, of Minnesota, continued his efforts to protect Federal employees from illegal personnel pressures imposed by the administration, particularly in the matter of freedom of speech, in order to bring about Democratic Fund-raising events.

Representative ROBERT A. ADAMS, of Indiana, sought vainly to secure for the service men fighting in Vietnam educational benefits similar to those granted to the United States a number of years ago, and to labor to launch a full investigation of that program.

A rent supplement program whereby taxpayers would help to pay the rent of families living in areas most in need of help $8,200 for a year and possessing assets of as much as $15,000.

A foreign aid program of $3.2 billion was adopted as the starting point of the program.

A farm bill which will mean that Government payments in 1966 will equal one-third of the farm income but will not solve the farm problem.

A Public Works and Reinvestment Act modeled after the discarded Area Redevelopment Act and the Advanced Public Works Act; and

A Highway Reinvestment Act rushed through the House without adequate deliberation.

Republican Members even voted against a pay raise for themselves, as a result of which the majority of the Members voted in opposition to a majority of the Democrats.

In order to provide a more efficient and vigorous foreign policy, Republicans unsuccessfully attempted to place restrictions on foreign aid funds so that the American taxpayer would not be financing anti-American revolutionaries.

Several enactments of the past session received strong Republican support. Republican House Members judged each bill on its merits and gave approval to administration programs that served the public interest.

Among the bills that were given strong Republican support on final passage were the following: the Higher Education Act, vocational training loan bill, the immigration bill, the Export Control Act, constitutional amendment on Presidential succession, the Older Americans Act of 1966, various bills in the field of health, the Civil Rights Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Housing Act, the Social Security Act, the Social Security Act Amendments of 1965, various bills in the field of education, the National Consumer Commission Act, the Federal Housing Administration amendments, the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, the Housing and Urban Development Act, the Balanced Budget Act, and the Veterans' Administration Act.

Speaking for the Democratic minority in the House of Representatives can take pride in the fact that the Republicans' floor leaders are its political opposition. Their success cannot be measured by the standards of the Republicans of the past.

Republican Members of the House of Representatives introduced bills which 793-159-691

compete a comprehensive, broad-based, and constructive legislative program.

At least 256 bills extending and liberalizing social security were offered by Republicans. These bills dealt with a wide range of problems, and the majority of them were introduced to reduce the burden of the aged and the disabled, to restructure the Social Security Administration, to provide for a more discriminating approach to the problem of poverty, and to increase the benefits similar to those granted to the United States in 1966.

In the field of foreign affairs, Republican Members introduced bills providing for a new program of medical care for the aged.

At least 59 Republicans introduced bills providing for a new program of medical care for the aged. The three major approaches were typified in the proposals of Representative Thomas B. Curns—H.R. 3728; Representative Frank T. Bow—H.R. 21, and Representative John W. Byrnes—H.R. 7057.

At least 60 Republicans introduced bills providing for a new program of medical care for the aged. The three major approaches were typified in the proposals of Representative Thomas B. Curns—H.R. 3728; Representative Frank T. Bow—H.R. 21, and Representative John W. Byrnes—H.R. 7057.

At least 46 Republicans proposed a constitutional amendment to permit the people to employ factors in addition to the principle of majority rule in the determination of State and local governments.

The general conclusions to be drawn from these votes are a Republican preference for a more discriminating approach to the problem of poverty, and to increase the benefits similar to those granted to the United States in 1966.

Republican Members of the House of Representatives introduced bills which 793-159-691

CONCLUSION

Looking back on the session just concluded, the Republican Members of the House of Representatives can take pride in the fact that the Congress was a constructive body, independent and coequal with the Executive, judging legislation by the same standards as the Congress.

At least 60 Republicans introduced bills providing for a new program of medical care for the aged. The three major approaches were typified in the proposals of Representative Thomas B. Curns—H.R. 3728; Representative Frank T. Bow—H.R. 21, and Representative John W. Byrnes—H.R. 7057.

Nine Republicans introduced a freedom of information bill defining the authority of Federal agencies and offices to withhold information in order to make available a maximum of information to citizens and taxpayers.

The House Republican conference adopted the recommendation of its task force on education, headlined by Representatives Alexey Green, of Minnesota, for legislation granting a tax credit against the cost of higher education. A large number of Members have sponsored bills like Mr. Quie's which permits a credit up to an amount of $250 per student annually.

At least 256 bills extending and liberalizing social security were offered by Republicans. These bills dealt with a wide range of problems, and the majority of them were introduced to reduce the burden of the aged and the disabled, to restructure the Social Security Administration, to provide for a more discriminating approach to the problem of poverty, and to increase the benefits similar to those granted to the United States in 1966.

At least 256 bills extending and liberalizing social security were offered by Republicans. These bills dealt with a wide range of problems, and the majority of them were introduced to reduce the burden of the aged and the disabled, to restructure the Social Security Administration, to provide for a more discriminating approach to the problem of poverty, and to increase the benefits similar to those granted to the United States in 1966.

Of these reasons, a majority of Republicans in the House of Representatives, in contrast to a majority of the Democrats, voted against such things as:

Doubling the authorization for the poverty program at a time when house administrators are trying to fund the Administration's requests on Education and Labor to launch a full investigation of that program.

A rent supplement program whereby taxpayers would help to pay the rent of families living in areas most in need of help $8,200 for a year and possessing assets of as much as $15,000.

A foreign aid program of $3.2 billion which all three nations need drastic overhaul.

A farm bill which will mean that Government payments in 1966 will equal one-third of the farm income but will not solve the farm problem.

A Public Works and Reinvestment Act modeled after the discarded Area Redevelopment Act and the Advanced Public Works Act; and

A Highway Reinvestment Act rushed through the House without adequate deliberation.

Republican Members even voted against a pay raise for themselves, as a result of which the majority of the Members voted in opposition to a majority of the Democrats.

In order to provide a more efficient and vigorous foreign policy, Republicans unsuccessfully attempted to place restrictions on foreign aid funds so that the American taxpayer would not be financing anti-American revolutionaries in existing nations that are helping North Vietnam in the war in which 100,000 American fighting men are now engaged.
Observations on the 1st Session of 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
ON
HON. GERALD R. FORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 22, 1943

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the record of the 1st session of the 89th Congress is spotty. Along with the enactment of some meritorious and needed legislation, the Congress often acted hastily, blindly, and indiscriminately.

The majority leader of the Senate, Mr. Mansfield, of Montana, has confessed serious deficiencies in the way enacted by the Congress this year. He has announced that the 89th session of the 89th Congress should “spend less time on paper legislation and more time correcting oversights in legislation we have just passed.” He has said that the Congress “must tighten up the hasty enactments” and must eliminate from the laws of the session just ended “a number of gaps and any number of rough edges, irritations and overlaps.”

The Manfield confession should be good for the soul of the American people. It should convince them that one-party government does not serve them well.

One conclusion to be drawn from the 1st session of the 89th Congress is that whenever the party that holds power of the executive branch of the national Government also enjoys overwhelming dominance in the House of Representatives, the Congress becomes a satellite of the President.

The failure of the Congress to act as a deliberative body, especially with respect to the Senate, is the most striking feature of this past session. Unlike other days of the session, it rubberstamped the proposals of the White House in far too many instances.

The members of the American Political Science Association who gathered in Washington in early September of this year felt that the legislative initiative has passed irrevocably to the executive branch. One of the experts at that convention, Lewis A. Dexter, said that Congress will come to have the same importance in the American system of government that the House of Lords has in the British, particularly if a future President resembles Lyndon B. Johnson.

Eric Berwind wrote: “We know of a number of Congressmen who would be very grateful to lack what they have really done this year.

He also found that the Congress has so often acted under a ‘curse of hasty enactments’ that the ‘once-demonstrative, pliable, compliant, Congress has lost much of its integrity.”

One of the leading newspapers in the home State of the Vice President summed it up this way: “Anyone following the daily deliberations of the House of Representatives must be struck by the rush in which the Congress is directing legislation to the President’s desk. It is not, in fact, a deliberative body. Representative government is in a null and void state.”

Columnist Ted Lewis said: “The presidential image of a miracle producer of new laws makes the legislative branch of government appear to be a creature of the executive branch.”

The Chicago Tribune, in an editorial entitled "Legislating by Scoop Shield," said:

It would take a truck scale to weigh the legislation forwarded by the White House and automatically approved, much of it without a single amendment of any kind in the House and in the Senate. It is in an avalanche of measures to which the Constitution allows the President’s veto. And, the President, according to the Tribune, is doing this in a null and void state.

The Indianapolis Journal editorialized: “Any Congress which rubberstamps the right of the President to ‘block’ a number of bills is a continuing threat to the Republic.”

It is one thing for a Congress to adopt Presidential proposals after thorough deliberation and adequate discussion. It is quite another thing for a Congress to rush through such proposals without careful scrutiny and without reasonable debate. No Congress that performed its constitutional duty could do just another job of which Senator Mansfield indicted the present Congress when he said that “in fact now devote most of its energy to tightening up its hasty enactments.”

On many important bills the House of Representatives acted without adequate consideration, without full hearings in committees, and without sufficient debate on the floor.

That art and humanities bill was railroaded through the Committee on Education and Labor after about 15 minutes of consideration. Even a motion by the minority that the bill be read was summarily rejected by the majority. When the committee met to act on the bill, the members were presented for the first time with a new committee print, dated the same day, containing a number of significant amendments which the minority members had never seen before. Thereafter, several additional amendments, which the minority members had already, were quickly adopted in committee, and the bill was reported with great haste.

The Education and Labor Committee made virtually no change in the administration’s bill to provide assistance for elementary and secondary education, despite vigorous bipartisan complaints about the formula for distributing Federal funds contained in the bill. On the floor, at least 10 of 25 amendments were rejected with no discussion due to the cut-off rule on debate.

As this far-reaching legislation was being considered by the House of Representatives, Democrat Congresswoman
prevented the religious liberty of employees whose religious beliefs clash with company religious union membership, and the certainty that employees would be protected from imprisonment by joining a union-controlled union.

The Washington Post commented:

"One unfortunate oversight in the laws of the session can be cited to illustrate the congressional action. By increasing the penalties for pollution, the Congress inadvertently caused the termination or reduction of the pensions of tens of thousands of veterans. The added social security payment meant a reduction of the incomes of these veterans."

Fracions on the administration's original highway beautification proposals were held by the Committee on Public Works on July 20, 21, and 22. Those hearings were adjourned with the understanding that the complete proposals should be studied further and acted upon early next year. Without warning, the hearings were reopened on September 7, while the committee and its staff were absorbed with the imminent river to lake barriers hearing. The bill as it was then was debated and passed by the House of Representatives on September 16, and was tabled well after midnight. At one point in the proceedings the House voted 121 to 8 to allow the Senate to debate its bill on 5 separate amendments.

The very controversial bill to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947 was discussed fully on the Judiciary Committee or on the House floor. On the voting rights bill, the administration force on the Judiciary Committee methodically rejected all significant amendments offered by Republicans. On the civil rights bill of the same day the same attitude prevailed. With the exception of the Cramer amendment to prevent election irregularities, to pass an effective amendment offered by a Republican was virtually hopeless.

VOTE AND OVERLAP

The defects in the legislation enacted last year in the 86th Congress ended will come to light as the bills are put into effect. Problems of duplica-
tion and overlap will be encountered in the Federal-aid programs, in the fields of highway construction and public health.

The public works and redevelopment bill, providing aid to so-called depressed areas, overlaps the Appalachia bill.

The expanded poverty program overlaps the Appalachian area and a number of other proposed Federal-aid programs, which are oriented almost exclusively to children from low-income families, as well as vocational education and public assistance programs. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, passed after a Senate proposal to join a Community-controlled union.

The Washington Post commented:
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Fracions on the administration's original highway beautification proposals were held by the Committee on Public Works on July 20, 21, and 22. Those hearings were adjourned with the understanding that the complete proposals should be studied further and acted upon early next year. Without warning, the hearings were reopened on September 7, while the committee and its staff were absorbed with the imminent river to lake barriers hearing. The bill as it was then was debated and passed by the House of Representatives on September 16, and was tabled well after midnight. At one point in the proceedings the House voted 121 to 8 to allow the Senate to debate its bill on 5 separate amendments.
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The expanded poverty program overlaps the Appalachian area and a number of other proposed Federal-aid programs, which are oriented almost exclusively to children from low-income families, as well as vocational education and public assistance programs. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, passed after a Senate proposal to join a Community-controlled union.

The Washington Post commented:

"One unfortunate oversight in the laws of the session can be cited to illustrate the congressional action. By increasing the penalties for pollution, the Congress inadvertently caused the termination or reduction of the pensions of tens of thousands of veterans. The added social security payment meant a reduction of the incomes of these veterans."
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The Washington Post commented:

"One unfortunate oversight in the laws of the session can be cited to illustrate the congressional action. By increasing the penalties for pollution, the Congress inadvertently caused the termination or reduction of the pensions of tens of thousands of veterans. The added social security payment meant a reduction of the incomes of these veterans."
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The very controversial bill to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947 was discussed fully on the Judiciary Committee or on the House floor. On the voting rights bill, the administration force on the Judiciary Committee methodically rejected all significant amendments offered by Republicans. On the civil rights bill of the same day the same attitude prevailed. With the exception of the Cramer amendment to prevent election irregularities, to pass an effective amendment offered by a Republican was virtually hopeless.

VOTE AND OVERLAP

The defects in the legislation enacted last year in the 86th Congress ended will come to light as the bills are put into effect. Problems of duplica-
tion and overlap will be encountered in the Federal-aid programs, in the fields of highway construction and public health.

The public works and redevelopment bill, providing aid to so-called depressed areas, overlaps the Appalachia bill.

The expanded poverty program overlaps the Appalachian area and a number of other proposed Federal-aid programs, which are oriented almost exclusively to children from low-income families, as well as vocational education and public assistance programs. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, passed after a Senate proposal to join a Community-controlled union.

The Washington Post commented:

"One unfortunate oversight in the laws of the session can be cited to illustrate the congressional action. By increasing the penalties for pollution, the Congress inadvertently caused the termination or reduction of the pensions of tens of thousands of veterans. The added social security payment meant a reduction of the incomes of these veterans."

Fracions on the administration's original highway beautification proposals were held by the Committee on Public Works on July 20, 21, and 22. Those hearings were adjourned with the understanding that the complete proposals should be studied further and acted upon early next year. Without warning, the hearings were reopened on September 7, while the committee and its staff were absorbed with the imminent river to lake barriers hearing. The bill as it was then was debated and passed by the House of Representatives on September 16, and was tabled well after midnight. At one point in the proceedings the House voted 121 to 8 to allow the Senate to debate its bill on 5 separate amendments.

The very controversial bill to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947 was discussed fully on the Judiciary Committee or on the House floor. On the voting rights bill, the administration force on the Judiciary Committee methodically rejected all significant amendments offered by Republicans. On the civil rights bill of the same day the same attitude prevailed. With the exception of the Cramer amendment to prevent election irregularities, to pass an effective amendment offered by a Republican was virtually hopeless.

VOTE AND OVERLAP

The defects in the legislation enacted last year in the 86th Congress ended will come to light as the bills are put into effect. Problems of duplica-
tion and overlap will be encountered in the Federal-aid programs, in the fields of highway construction and public health.

The public works and redevelopment bill, providing aid to so-called depressed areas, overlaps the Appalachia bill.

The expanded poverty program overlaps the Appalachian area and a number of other proposed Federal-aid programs, which are oriented almost exclusively to children from low-income families, as well as vocational education and public assistance programs. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, passed after a Senate proposal to join a Community-controlled union.
The administration's bill to aid elementary and secondary schools—H.R. 3983—promised a measure to assist poverty-stricken children, is in fact the first and perhaps the only test of Republican proposals in the House of Representatives. Under this bill, $2.1 million will be granted by the Federal Government to Westchester County, the wealthiest in New York State, for the education of children from poor families. Sunflower County, Miss., with median family income only one-fifth that of Westchester County, will receive only $745,000 for the education of an equal number of children from poor families.

Republicans sought to make it a bill which would do what it professed to do: aid poor children under Federal control of State, local, and private schools.

The Republican effort was directed toward broadening the proposal to include areas of need within each State; second, reconciling differences in financial ability and need among States; third, concentrating the program upon the needs of the poor; and fourth, reducing the discretionary authority of the U.S. Commissioner of Education.

A Republican approach to the problem of expanding and improving elementary and secondary education was offered in H.R. 6349, offered by Representatives William A. Fram, of Ohio, and Thomas J. Pope, of Missouri, and others. This bill relied chiefly on the device of tax preference, in which 90 percent of the cost of providing schools through State and local taxes directly or indirectly as well as for those whose families could not afford to pay for education. This bill would have directed $3 to $5 annually from the Federal Treasury to aid schools to provide for additional support for education at the local level.

In addition, H.R. 6349 provided $20 million annually to the States for the construction of elementary and secondary schools in areas where they are needed.

Under this plan, some families with an income of 25 cents a day would be eligible to have a part of their rent paid by the Federal Government, or assistance in the purchase of a farm or home, or payments to localities to prevent poverty in that region that includes many severely depressed areas.

A Republican alternative, offered by Representative William C. Kramer, of Minnesota, and adopted as H.R. 6406, would also extend Federal assistance to all economically depressed areas throughout the Nation instead of to a single region. Unlike the administration bill, which provided for economic distress and high unemployment.

The Public Works and Development Act of 1966—Public Law 89-126—, like the Cramer bill, a measure intended to aid depressed areas throughout the Nation. It raises serious problems of duplication and conflict with the Appalachian Regional Development Act.

In spite of the fact that Republicans in this Congress hold only one-third of the seats in the House, the Republican minority exerted an important influence on legislation in the first term of the 90th Congress. The repeal of Federal excise taxes—a step which Republicans have advocated for many years and which was called for in the Republican platform of 1964—was accomplished in this session. In 1964, a Republican amendment to the excise tax bill provided for the conversion of the tax to an excise tax on a rate of 10 per cent. This amendment was passed, but the new rate was defeated by Democratic opposition.

Other changes made in the social security system were influenced by Republicans. Changes made in the system include the elimination of the earnings limit beyond which elderly people become ineligible to collect their social security benefits. The system lends itself to the task of providing a steady income to elderly people who by reason of age or infirmity are not able to work or who are not able to earn an income. This system is one of the major means of providing for the elderly a secure, comfortable old age.
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Community issued a thoughtful report on market conditions in the Atlantic Alliance and improving the strained relations of the United States with France after the negotiations between the two nations.

Representative Findlay, along with Representative Ralph Harvey of Indiana, also led the in an unsuccessful fight against the administration on the side of the taxpayer for the tariffs for the taxpayers of the United States as a part of the excess profits which foreign sugar producers derive from sales in this country because Government action maintains a domestic price more than double the price in the world market.

Representative Rasure J. Cercott, of Pennsylvania, fought unsuccessfully to bring about an adjustment of the pay of Federal employees to provide full comparability with pay scales in private industry. Though full comparability is given up by the administration, it is opposed to putting this principle in practice.

Representative Archer Nelson, of Minnesota, continued his efforts to protect Federal employees from illegal political pressures imposed by the administration, particularly in the matter of forced contributions to Democratic fund raisers.

Representative Ross Action, of Indiana, sought vainly to secure for the services of Federal employees a comparability of benefits similar to those granted to the veterans of the Second World War and Korea.

Representative William S. Malliaris, of Illinois, opposed the self-serving effort to secure legislative action to reinvoke the merchant shipping of the United States.

Republican house Republicans in the House of Representatives held fast on important votes throughout the session. Republicans opposed and sought to modify the self-dealing, ambiguous, blank check approach of the Democratic majority.

Democrats showed themselves more concerned than most Democrats about such things as prudent use of tax dollars, the danger of inflation fired by high increases in Government spending and unending deficits, the shifting of State, local, and private initiative by the spread of an overwhelming Central Government, the peril of runaway bureaucracy, and the application of the common sense principles of good management in Federal programs.

For all of these reasons, a majority of Republicans in the House of Representatives, in contrast to a majority of the Democrats, voted against such things as:

- Denying the authorization for the poverty program at a time when local administration prompted the Committee on Education and Labor to launch a full investigation of the program.
- A rent supplement program whereby taxpayers would be enabled to pay the increased taxes families earning a mere amount of income were paying taxes and possessing assets of $6,000 or more.
- A foreign aid program of $3.2 billion in 1967, which all agree needs drastic overhauling.
- A farm bill which will mean that Government payments in 1968 will equal one-third of real net farm income and which will not solve the farm problem.
- A Public Works and Reemployment Act modeled after the discretional Area Redevelopment Act and the Advanced Public Works Act; and
- A Highway Reauthorization Act pushed through the House without adequate deliberation.

Republican Members even voted against a pay raise for themselves, again unlike a majority of the Democrats.

In order to provide a more consistent and vigorous foreign policy, Republicans successfully attempted to place restraints of foreign aid funds so that the American taxpayer would not be flim-flammed, risking American regime reestablishing nations that are helping North Vietnam and Indonesia in the war in which 120,000 American fighting men are now engaged.

For these reasons most Republicans supported a prohibition against aid to nations engaged in supporting North Vietnam and against further ships of agricultural commodities to Egypt's Nasser and Indonesia's Sukarno.

In order to preserve the right of State and local governments, most Republicans sought to:

- Retain the power of State governors over poverty program projects;
- Maintain the power of the States to forbid compulsory unionism;
- Provide the people of each State to decide the basis of representation in one house of their State legislatures;
- Defeat appropriations for a federally controlled National Teacher Corps;
- Secure legislative recognition of the rights of States to set standards of water purity in rivers instead of transferring this authority to the Federal Government;
- Maintain State authority to determine the use to be made of areas adjoining highways; and
- Maintain the right of States to deny the suffrage to people unable to read or write in the English language.

Planning and Research Committee

Early in the session the planning and research committee was established as an integral part of the Republican conference of the House of Representatives. This committee was agreed upon to aid the Executive Branch in its activity toward the development of long-term solutions to national problems.

The planning and research committee, in August a report entitled, "Foreign Assistance: Some Necessary Aspects of the Historical Record." Columnist Rosemary Drummond said of this report:

"This is a national report."

Headed by Representative Charles E. Goodsell, of New York, this committee supervises the activities of 13 task forces, each of which has spent this year in the study of major public policy problems in its field of jurisdiction. Several of the task forces have made reports containing constructive proposals in 1965. All will make a substantial contribution to the positive Republican program in 1966.

The task forces and their chairmen:

- Agriculture: Orrin Lause, of Minnesota.
- Congressional reform and minority staffing: James Cleveland, of New Hampshire.
- Economic opportunity: Peter Garlinghouse, of New Jersey.
- Education: Albert H. Quie, of Minnesota.

United Nations:

NATO and Atlantic Community: Paul Findlay, of Illinois.

Nuclear affairs: Clark Homer, of California.

Platform implementation: James Barrett, of Montana.

Unemployment compensation system: John W. Byerly, of Wisconsin.


Urban and suburban affairs: Clark MacGregor, of Minnesota.


Republican support of Administration bills

Several enactments of the past session received strong Republican support. Republican House Members judged each bill on its merits and gave approval to administration measures that served the public interest.

Among the bills that were given strong Republican support in final passage were the following:

- The higher education bill;
- Vocational training loan bill, the immigration bill, the Export Control Act, constitutional amendment on Presidential succession, the Older Americans Act of 1965, various bills in the field of health, exotic tax cuts, manpower development and training bill, expansion of veterans' benefits, various antitrust bills, small business, defense and military personnel, legislation for the control of air and water pollution and water resources planning, and the voter rights bill.

A sampling of Republican legislative proposals

Republican Members of the House of Representatives introduced bills which comprised a comprehensive, broad-based, and constructive legislative program.

At least 256 bills expanded and liberalizing social security were offered by Republicans. These bills dealt with such matters as reduction of the age requirement for beneficiaries, increasing the maximum age for eligibility of children, expansion of the system to groups not presently covered, and increasing the amounts of survivors' permissable without sacrifice of benefits. At least 61 Republican bills were introduced for the reduction or repeal of excise taxes.

At least 40 Republicans introduced voting rights legislation, generally patterned after the Ford-McCulloch bill.

At least 54 Republicans introduced bills providing for a new program of medical care for the aged. The three major approaches were typified in the proposals of Representative Thomas B. Curtis—H.R. 729; Representative Frank T. Bow—H.R. 51; and Representative John W. Byerly—H.R. 1967.

At least 48 Republicans proposed a constitutional amendment to permit the people to employ factors in addition to population in the apportionment of one house of State legislatures.

At least 27 Republicans introduced bills to establish a coordinating office concerned with national nutrition policy in the Executive Office of the President.

At least 26 Republicans introduced bills establishing a Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government to do the job which two Hoover Commissions did in the past.

Nine Republicans introduced a freedom of information bill defining the authority of Federal agencies and officials to withhold information in order to make available a maximum of information to citizens and taxpayers.

The House Republican conference adopted the recommendation of its task force on education, headed by Representative Albert Quie, of Minnesota, for legislation granting a tax credit against the costs of higher education. A large number of Members have sponsored bills like Mr. Quie's which permits a credit up to an amount of $225 per student annually.

At least 78 Republicans have joined with Representative Thomas Curtis, of Missouri, in offering the Human Investment Act, a bill granting credits against the Federal income tax in business for the expenses of retraining present or prospective employees to upgrade their skills.

At least 40 Republicans have introduced legislation of the type recommended by the House Republican task force on agriculture, headed by Representative Ore Lause, of Minnesota, to establish a World Food Study Commission to determine population trends and food needs for the future.

This list could be extended indefinitely. It is meant to be illustrative not exhaustive.

Conclusion

Looking back on the session just concluded, the Republican Members of the House of Representatives can take pride in the role that they have played. They can take pride in what they should be--a deliberative body, independent of and coequal with the Executive, judgment binding by the sole standard of the national interest. Their success cannot be measured in terms of the votes on which they prevailed--which were few. The verdict on their work will not be known until the people speak in the elections of 1968.
Observations on the 1st Session of 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the record of the 1st session of the 89th Congress is spotty. Along with the enactment of some meritorious and needed legislation, the Congress often acted hastily, blindly, and indiscriminately.

The majority leader of the Senate, Mr. MANFIELD, of Montana, has confessed serious deficiencies in the laws enacted by the Congress this year. He has announced that the 2d 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 that the Congress “must tighten up the hasty enactments” and must eliminate from the laws of the session just ended “a number of cases and any number of rough edges, overextensions and overlaps.”

The Manfield confession should be good for the soul of the American people. It should convince them that one-party government does not serve them well.

One conclusion to be drawn from the 1st session of the 89th Congress is that whenever the party that holds possession of the executive branch of the National Government also enjoys overwhelming dominance in the Congress, the Congress becomes a satellite of the President.

The failure of the Congress to act as a deliberative body, coequal with the Executive, is the most striking feature of this past session. Until the closing days of the session, it rubberstamped the proposals of the White House in far too many instances.

The members of the American Political Science Association who gathered in Washington in early September of this year felt that the legislative initiative has passed irretrievably to the executive branch. One of the experts at that convention, Lewis A. Dexter, said that the Congress will come to have the same importance in the American system of government as the House of Lords has in the British, particularly if several future Presidents resemble Lyndon Johnson.

Eric Sevareid wrote:
We know of a number of Congressmen who would be very grateful to learn what they have really done this year.

He also found that the Congress has so often acted under “a curious kind of intimidation” that the “one-called title of Senator or Representative has lost much of its prestige.”

One of the leading newspapers in the home State of the Vice President summed it up this way:
Anyone following the daily deliberations of the House of Representatives must be struck by the ruthlessness with which the Democratic majority of so-called liberals is stamping its mailed foot. It is not, in fact, a delusive body. Representative government is in a sad and critical state.

Columnist Ted Lewis said:
"The presidential image of a miracle producer of new laws makes the legislative branch of Government appear to be a creature of the executive branch."

The Chicago Tribune, in an editorial entitled "Legislating by Hoop Shovel," said:
"It would take a truck axle to weigh the legislation forwarded by the White House and automatically approved, most of it wasteful, much of it unnecessary, and all of it putting the individual in the grip of the Federal "arm."

He (the President) has been legislating everything and anything, and, with two-thirds majorities in either Chamber, he has a Congress of robots that is totally compliant.

The Knoxville Journal editorialized:
Any Congress which voluntarily yields its right to perform as a coequal part of the Federal Establishment, as this one has, is a continuing threat to the Nation.

It is one thing for a Congress to adopt Presidential proposals after thorough deliberation and adequate discussion. It is quite another thing for a Congress to rush through such proposals without careful scrutiny and without reasonable debate.

No Congress that performed its constitutional duty would do the specified job of which Senator Mansfield indicted the present Congress when he said that it must now devote most of its efforts to tightening up "the hasty enactments."

EXAMPLES OF RUBBISH STAMPING BY THE CONGRESS

On many important bills the House of Representatives acted without adequate consideration, without full hearings in committee, and without sufficient debate on the floor.

The arts and humanities bill was railroaded through the Committee on Education and Labor after about 15 minutes of consideration. Even a motion by the minority that the bill be read was summarily rejected by the majority. When the committee met to act on the bill, the members were presented for the first time with a new committee print, dated the same day, containing a number of significant amendments which the minority members had never seen before.

Thereafter, several additional amendments, which the Republican members had never seen, were quickly adopted in committee, and the bill was reported with great haste.

The Education and Labor Committee made virtually no change in the administration bill to provide assistance for elementary and secondary education, despite vigorous bipartisan complaints about the formula for distributing Federal funds contained in the bill. On the floor, at least 10 of 25 amendments were rejected without discussion due to the gag-rule limitation on debate.

As this far-reaching legislation was being considered by the House of Representatives, Democratic Congresswoman
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The administration of the Freedom of Information Act has faced challenges in managing requests, particularly with the increase in requests during the digital age. The act, signed into law in 1966, grants citizens the right to access government records except under specific exemptions.

The Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) has been a cornerstone of government transparency. However, the implementation of new technologies and the shift in information requests have put pressure on the legislation, necessitating updates to better suit modern needs. The act continues to empower citizens to access important information, fostering an informed democracy.

Another significant piece of legislation is the Medicare and Medicaid programs. These programs are aimed at providing health care to elderly Americans and low-income individuals, enhancing their quality of life and reducing financial burdens.

Medicare and Medicaid are federal programs that provide health insurance to eligible individuals. Medicare covers hospital insurance, doctor's services, and some prescription drugs. Medicaid, on the other hand, provides coverage for those with low income.

The passage of these programs was a response to the pressing need for universal health care, and their impact continues to be felt in communities across the United States.

In summary, the legislative landscape of the 1960s was shaped by a variety of initiatives aimed at improving the lives of citizens, from political accountability to health care access. These pieces of legislation, such as the Freedom of Information Act and the Medicare and Medicaid programs, have had lasting effects on American society.
The administration bill, with its provisions for a new system of rent supplements for low-income families, was not without critics. Some, like Representative John W. Wydler of New Jersey, argued that the bill did not go far enough in providing assistance to the poorest of the poor. Wydler, along with other Democrats, proposed an amendment that would have extended the provisions of the bill to include families with incomes up to $11,000. The amendment was ultimately defeated in the House, but it highlighted the ongoing debate over the scope and reach of federal housing assistance programs.

In addition to housing, the administration's bill also included provisions for national defense, with a focus on the war in Vietnam. The administration had increased its defense budget in response to the growing threat of communism, and the bill reflected this increased spending. However, there was also criticism of the administration's approach to the war, with some arguing that it was not an effective strategy for ending the conflict.

The bill also included provisions for disaster relief and public health, with a focus on disaster relief in areas affected by hurricanes and floods. The administration's approach to disaster relief was criticized by some who argued that it was not sufficient to meet the needs of affected communities.

Overall, the Congressional Record reflects the ongoing debates and controversies of the mid-1960s, with a focus on the administration's proposals for federal reform and the political opposition they faced from both parties.

---

**CONGRESSIONAL RECORD**

APPELLACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT

The administration bill, described as the "most significant piece of legislation of its kind," was passed in the House of Representatives by a vote of 432 to 35. The bill authorized $4.2 billion in federal funding for regional development projects, with a focus on the Appalachian region. The bill was supported by both Republicans and Democrats, with some notable opposition coming from Representative John C. Evinson of Pennsylvania, who argued that the bill was too large and would lead to inefficiencies in the use of federal funds.

The bill also included provisions for the establishment of a new Cabinet agency, the Appalachian Regional Commission, with the authority to spend up to $200 million over 10 years. The commission was to be composed of representatives from the Appalachian states, with the goal of promoting economic development in the region.

The bill was seen as a major victory for President Johnson, who had long advocated for federal assistance to the Appalachian region. The bill was also seen as a major victory for the administration's "Great Society" program, with a focus on promoting economic opportunity and social justice for all Americans.

---

**CONGRESSIONAL RECORD**

The Medicare bill passed by the Congress in 1965 was a major piece of legislation that provided federal funding to states for the implementation of a national health insurance program. The bill was seen as a major victory for the administration's "Great Society" program, with a focus on promoting economic opportunity and social justice for all Americans.

The bill was passed in the House of Representatives by a vote of 409 to 37, with only 14 Republicans voting against the bill. The bill was seen as a major victory for the administration's "Great Society" program, with a focus on promoting economic opportunity and social justice for all Americans.

---

**CONGRESSIONAL RECORD**

The immigration bill passed by the Congress in 1965 was a major piece of legislation that provided federal funding to states for the implementation of a national health insurance program. The bill was seen as a major victory for the administration's "Great Society" program, with a focus on promoting economic opportunity and social justice for all Americans.

The bill was passed in the House of Representatives by a vote of 409 to 37, with only 14 Republicans voting against the bill. The bill was seen as a major victory for the administration's "Great Society" program, with a focus on promoting economic opportunity and social justice for all Americans.
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Redevelopment Act and the
Advanced Public Works Act; and
A Highway Beautification Act rushed
through the House without adequate de-
liberation.
Republican Members even voted
against a pay raise for themselves, again
unlike a majority of the Democrats.
In order to provide a more competent
and vigorous foreign policy, Republicans
unanimously attempted to place re-
strictions of foreign aid funds so that
the American taxpayer would not be fl-
agging anti-American regimes or
all states that are helping North
Vietnam in the war in which 150,000
American fighting men are now engaged.
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A Highway Beautification Act rushed
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liberation.
Republican Members even voted
against a pay raise for themselves, again
unlike a majority of the Democrats.
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and vigorous foreign policy, Republicans
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Vietnam in the war in which 150,000
American fighting men are now engaged.
THE JOINT SENATE-HOUSE
REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP

Press Release

Issued following a Leadership Meeting
October 23, 1965

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN:

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 had an echo, not a choice.

A movie of the 89th Congress would be like an episode of the old-time serial which always ended as the heroine was pushed off a 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 bits under the Administration's locomotive or whether the Reapportionment Amendment survives its fall from the cliff.

We would caution those who judge the work of the 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."

It is highly significant that Senator Mansfield, in reviewing the work of this session before the Democratic Conference, could 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 correction of the mistakes of the first session.

(Ford statement -- page 2)
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 function as a co-equal branch of government, the integrity of state and local governments is undermined, and the public interest is often jeopardized.

The Executive branch unchecked becomes 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 chance, 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 explanation and debate.

Protest has been heard from both sides of the aisle. Democratic Congresswoman Green, of Oregon, early in the session, condemned 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 existing 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.
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STATEMENT BY HOUSE MINORITY LEADER GERALD R. FORD, R-MICH.

I urge this Congress to change its rubber-stamping, loose-spending ways when it returns from Easter Recess.

The 89th Congress in this session has continued to be a rubber stamp for the White House. On critical votes most Democrats have done whatever President Johnson told them to do. They don't seem to have minds of their own.

This Congress in the first three months of this year has resumed the wild spending spree it embarked on in 1965. This has caused painful inflation, increases in automobile and telephone excise taxes, and now the strong possibility of an income tax increase.

The way the Johnson Administration and the top-heavy Democratic majorities in Congress are throwing the people's money around, one would almost think there was no war going on in Vietnam. It's acting like a business-as-usual Congress, not a war Congress.

It's claimed this is one of the hardest working of all Congresses. I say the hardest work is being done in certain major committees by those Democrats intent on inflating already bloated Administration spending requests.

It's claimed this has been one of the most productive Congresses. I say this Congress has moved at a rather slow pace, and the product is nothing to be proud of. Apart from quick action on emergency money requests for the multi-billion-dollar Vietnam war, the thing that stands out is Mr. Johnson's $6 billion tax bill.

It's said this Congress is living up to the reputation it established in the first session. That's true. It is living up to a reputation for big spending and total disregard of the taxpayer's wishes.

# # #
STATEMENT BY REP. GERALD R. FORD, (R-MICHIGAN) HOUSE MINORITY LEADER.

The Republican Leadership of the House of Representatives and the Minority Members of the Education and Labor Committee believe that the scheduled meeting of the committee this Thursday, September 22, should be open to the public and the press.

Without prejudging the important questions involving the rules of the committee, which are primarily in the hands of the Democratic majority, we feel that decisions must not be taken behind closed doors in an atmosphere of "smoke filled room." The questions at issue are not matters of national security, but directly relate to public confidence in the conduct of Congressional business. They must not be resolved by anything remotely smacking of a "deal" but should be debated and decided with the full knowledge of the American people through representatives of press, radio and television.

Unless the Democratic majority agrees to this sensible procedure, as we hope it will, the ranking Republican member of the committee, Rep. William H. Ayres of Ohio, will move at the outset of the meeting to put the question to a vote of the committee.

# # #
STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE FORD:  

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

Can We Afford Your Automatic-Democratic Congress?

This may be, in some respects, a push-button world. It may be, in some respects, a computer civilization. It may be, here and there, that the rubber stamp has its proper place and function. But, the push-button, the computer and the rubber stamp wielded in the White House have not yet won the approval of the American people where their Representatives and Senators in the Congress are concerned.

Does the Johnson-Humphrey Administration want not only a blank check but push-button, computerized, rubber stamp voting in the Senate and in the House? This the American people will no longer tolerate.

Proof positive of this Administration's push-button psychology is the voting record of those forty-five freshman Democrats, elected in 1964 from districts formerly Republican, whose automatic responses to the wishes of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration are recorded for all to see.

Item: On reduction of foreign aid (authorization), 1965. This was defeated by 41 votes. 38 of these were automatic-Democratic freshman votes.


Item: On anti-poverty program expansion (recommittal). Recommittal was defeated by 49 votes. 39 of these were automatic-Democratic freshman votes.

Item: On the repeal of 14B -- the right to work. The bill passed by 18 votes. 41 votes for it were automatic-Democratic freshman votes.
Item: On rent subsidies (recommittal), the margin was 8 votes. 36 automatic-Democratic freshmen voted to keep this bill alive.

Says Fortune Magazine (September, 1966):
"... those forty-five provided the saving margin for a number of the more expansive and expensive Administration programs..."

This automatic-Democratic response by new members of the House was echoed by that of the rest of the top-heavy Democratic majority in the House. The push-button, the computer, the rubber stamp wielded by the Johnson-Humphrey Administration were in full force in every instance. The result: a travesty on the legislative process, a gross disservice to the will and the wishes of the American people.

No free society can long survive dominance by an unthinking computer, nor dominance by an unthinking, unrestrained, top-heavy legislative majority. This Democratic Congress, with its 294 to 139 majority in the House and its 67 to 33 majority in the Senate, has lost its independence. It is the tool of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration. The Administration and this Democratic Congress must bear full and joint responsibility for the failures and the continuing problems we face. This fact cannot be contradicted. Its simple arithmetic cannot be argued.

In our great tradition, the will of the majority must prevail, yet the will of the minority must both be respected and remain vital if, as has invariably happened in world history, an overwhelming majority, seeking unreasoning power, is not to silence, subdue and then suffocate the essential minority.

We cannot believe for a moment that the American people will any longer accept a push-button Congress or consensus by computer. We believe they agree increasingly that only in a healthy balance of numbers and opinions can this free land survive and prevail.

Therefore, Mr. President: Our Question-of-the-Week:

Can We Afford Your Automatic-Democratic Congress?
STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN  
September 22, 1966

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

Can We Afford Your Automatic-Democratic Congress?

Seldom has the hypocrisy of numbers been better illustrated than in the voting during this past week on the Civil Rights bill. The Republican minority and its Leadership in the Senate have been indicted and damned by the Johnson-Humphrey Administration and its Democratic majority for having killed the Civil Rights bill. How, conceivably, can men of intelligence and good-will so overlook that same simple arithmetic to which Mr. Ford has just made reference?

There are 67 Democrats in the Senate. There are 33 Republicans. This being so, how under Heaven, can it be concluded that the Republicans defeated Civil Rights? Had the Johnson-Humphrey Administration truly wished it, had the Democrats in the Senate truly sought it, the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966 would, without doubt, at this very moment, be the law of the land. As one writer put it in comment on the classic question of "Who killed Cock Robin?" it had to be a Democratic arrow -- not that of the Republican minority.

Happily for the nation's best interest, fortunately for the freedom of the individual, the Republican minority, outnumbered as it was, reflected the will of our people to a degree that made converts of regular Democrats and resulted in a vote that assured the right of every American to preserve the integrity of his own judgment and to determine the future of his own home.

The will of the people in this instance prevailed, but it could never have done so if a determined minority had not made clear the issues involved and in so doing won the respect and the response of many others.

It is unwise, it is dangerous and it can be disastrous, when an overwhelming majority is permitted to prevail without question or hindrance. Only as a majority is repeatedly questioned and checked by a strong minority can the foundations of this Republic be preserved. That we, a present minority, would welcome majority status is undeniable, but until that inevitable day we believe it all-important to the American people that our numbers and our hand be strengthened sufficiently to outlaw forever from Capitol Hill the push-button, the computer, the soulless rubber stamp.

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

Can We Afford Your Automatic-Democratic Congress?
Republican Policy Committee Statement on Recommendations for
The Reorganization of Congress

We urge the immediate consideration of H.R. 17873, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1966. This bill would implement the important recommendations contained in the final report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress which was filed with the Congress on July 28, 1966.

The Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress was established by unanimous vote of both the House and the Senate in March of 1965. It has held 41 public hearings and received the views of 199 witnesses. The testimony, together with the statements, documents and an index, is contained in 16 printed volumes totaling 2,435 pages. Between January 19, 1966 and the filing of the report on July 28, 1966, the Committee and its staff met in over 50 executive sessions to consider the proposed reforms and to formulate its recommendations. The work of this Committee has been thorough and complete. Without question, the recommendations contained in this report, if enacted into law, would make Congress a more effective institution for carrying out its basic functions.

The recommendations of the Joint Committee, as implemented by H.R. 17873, include:

1. The establishment of a Joint Committee on Congressional Operations with continuing authority to study the structure and procedures of Congress and to recommend additional reforms and changes.

2. The protection of the rights of the minority through the provision of additional committee staff, the right to present minority views and reports, the provision of equal time on conference reports, and the right to schedule witnesses during at least one day of committee hearings.

3. The creation of a House Committee on Standards and Conduct which would have an equal number of majority and minority members.

4. The authorization of measures designed to assist Members of Congress in the performance of their Congressional duties. Such measures would include enlarging committee staffs, strengthening and improving the Legislative Reference Service, and authorizing committees to employ consultants on an interim basis in order to take advantage of expertise in various fields of knowledge.

5. The implementation of fiscal controls and budgetary reforms that would include a greater utilization of the General Accounting Office, a multiple-year financial projection of programs and the updating of the budget on June 1 of each year, and the testimony of responsible Executive Department officials before the Appropriations Committee of each House within 30 days after the budget is presented to Congress.

6. The establishment of a Bill of Rights for committees that would: require the announcement of record votes; permit the majority to compel the filing of a report or a bill; prohibit the use of proxies; and require the printing of committee rules at the beginning of each session.
The Republican Members of the House of Representatives long have been interested in Congressional reform. At the outset of this session of Congress, a task force of the House Republicans on Congressional Reform and Minority Staffing was appointed to study the matter of Congressional reform in depth. As a result of the work of this task force, a book entitled "We Propose: A Modern Congress" has been published. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this book were presented in full to the Joint Committee and many of the recommendations of the committee stemmed from the work of the task force.

It is unfortunate that the Joint Committee rejected the recommendations by the Republican Members that a Committee on Procedures and Policies be created. This Committee would be given the 'power to examine into and report back to Congress on the expenditure of Federal funds by the Executive Branch to insure that they are spent efficiently and in accordance with the law. The Chairman of the Committee would be a Member of the minority party. This would insure that a thorough evaluation of the programs administered by the party in power would be made. It is difficult, if not impossible, for a committee of this type to conduct an effective investigation if the results are apt to reflect unfavorably on their own party's administration.

This is not a new idea. The House of Commons in Great Britain has a committee known as the Committee of Public Accounts whose chairman is by convention a leading member of the opposition. Also, in 1919, a Democratic Senator was designated to head the Teapot-Dome oil reserve investigation at a time when both Houses of Congress and the Executive Branch were controlled by the Republican Party.

We are also concerned by the fact that the Joint Committee failed to address itself to the problem of Executive Branch lobbying. Although the United States Code specifically prohibits the use of appropriated money to influence Members of Congress "to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress," substantial sums have been used for this purpose. In the recent past, long and detailed telegrams have been sent by Executive Department officials to Members of Congress urging their support of certain legislation. Similarly, long distance calls have been made and Members have been personally canvassed regarding their intentions with respect to a particular bill. The loophole in the present law that permits this type of activity, or the failure to adequately enforce the present law, must be corrected.

This Congress should not adjourn until it has acted on the Congressional reform recommendations. This legislation must not be filed and forgotten. Congress needs strengthening and modernizing and time is of the essence. Reforms should be enacted now so that the next Congress may utilize the new institutions and procedures. We pledge our support and assistance in getting this important legislation enacted into law. We call upon the Democratic leadership to schedule H.R. 17873 for immediate House consideration.
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WHERE OUR NATION STANDS—AT HOME AND ABROAD

I

Thirty-three years ago the present Republican Leader of the U.S. Senate came to Washington as a freshman in the House of Representatives. When the Congress convened in that March of 1933, the first thing we were told in a special message on domestic matters by the President of the United States was:

"The Government's house is not in order."

This is precisely the case today within the administration. A mere statement of this charge is not enough; therefore, the anatomy and morphology of the body of the so-called Great Society will be examined factually. The calcarine will be wiped away. The veneer and clapboard will be removed to expose the facts, or the withholding of facts.

In 16 years of service in the House of Representatives, and now in the 16th year of service in the U.S. Senate—7 of these years as Republican Leader—I have experienced and responded to the pressures and strains of a great depression, recovery and recession, peace, and World War II in President Roosevelt's administration, the Korean war in President Truman's administration, and now the Vietnam war in President Johnson's administration.

Through most of it the morale of our great Republic was solidly grounded upon the tough virtues of our fathers. But today, what had appeared to be a golden glow only 2 years ago has been broken by rolls of thunder. This can be observed as ministers plead from the pulpit for a good society instead of a great society; as journalists strive to obtain truth from the Government; as plain citizens ask one another, or themselves, "just what's going on?" "What gives?"

Uncertainty, queasy doubts, bewilderment, have spread across the country; labor and business, the farmer and small businessman, even the Federal civil service worker, all have been subjected to government-by-arm-twisting.

Unfortunately, optimism in many instances has been succeeded by pessimism; the stock market has lost some $120 billion since January according to Time magazine of October 14. And grievances seem to have deepened in many facets of our daily lives. Anger and fear have replaced much of our laughter.

Abroad, there is jeering and sneering at our country. Our flags are burned and spat upon. Our embassies attacked. In Vietnam the American death toll continues to mount.
These are great dilemmas of our times. Meanwhile, the administration goes its higgledy-piggledy way, its high priests no longer the flower of American culture but skilled political salesmen who pursue domestic social programs with the pop-eyed ardor of a Harpo Marx chasing blondes.

We hear, time and again, from the administration that it wants to end poverty. So do we all. What the country wants to know is when we're going to get around to the real war by practicing moderation at home.

And, so, we return to that March of 1933, and that message about order in our Government. In that same message we were admonished:

Too often * * * governments have been wrecked on the rocks of loose fiscal policy.

Now is the time to remember that statement. As Republican Leader in the Senate, I urgently request the Johnson administration to heed in wartime that peacetime warning of playing loose with the people's money.

II

The 2d session of the 89th Congress is about to close. It is the appropriate occasion for a summation of our times.

1. This has been the year when an additional 150,000 Americans were sent abroad to fight a war which already is the longest, and the third largest, war in our history.

2. This has been the year when some 14,000 National Guardsmen were sent to guard our streets at home—in Dayton, in Chicago, in San Francisco, in Cleveland, in Benton Harbor, in Wauwatosa, and in the year before in Selma, in Montgomery, in Springfield, in Los Angeles, in Natchez.

3. This has been the year when law enforcement officers were called to a dozen other cities to quell violence in our streets—from Troy to New Jersey to Jacksonville to South Bend; from Des Moines and Baltimore and Brooklyn to Washington, Providence, and Perth Amboy.

4. This has been the year when people were afraid to walk the streets alone; when police were confronted by a gigantic increase in crime of 46 percent from 1960 to 1965; and when the number of children arrested under the age of 18 increased by 54.5 percent.

5. This has been the year when inflation sent the cost of living skyrocketing to the highest in all our history and when the real spendable earnings of people were less than just a year ago, regardless of pay raises.

These are facts. Straightforward. Undeorned. Indisputable. These are great dilemmas of our times.

And all of them are conspicuously unsolved under the Great Society.
No improvement is noted after another year of Great Society diplomacy. Then, the United Nations observed its 21st birth anniversary and its future, both financially and from the standpoint of world influence, was uncertain. It is still that way after another year. As the population explosion throughout the world continued, poverty, hunger, war, and turmoil stalked the world and the Four Horsemen of despair rode relentlessly to broadcast pessimism and dismay. It is the same today, only worse. As the year started in Vietnam, the number of American troops neared 200,000, young blood continued to flow, and peace or truce seemed at best a dim hope. After almost a year, the administration reports 220,000 troops, plus 20,000 men in our naval fleet operating off Vietnam, plus 25,000 or more troops in nearby Thailand. And American dead and wounded have passed the 22,000 mark. The budget for fiscal year 1967 topped the $100 billion mark for the first time in our history, exclusive of trust funds and cash flow, and high spending for Great Society programs remained unabated. It remains unabated after still another year of the Great Society. The poverty warriors were embroiled in internecine strife over whether the poverty generals in Washington or the party's political lieutenant in the field were to administer this somewhat fantastic adventure, and the program made the progress of a snail in low gear. This is still the case today. Farmers were groaning as 1966 began. The prices which farmers received for their produce measured against what they had to pay for goods and equipment to pursue their operations were lower than before and there were no signs of improvement. And after almost another year, the farmer is worse off than ever. The march of growing Federal power continued without letup or hindrance, increasing the dangers of monolithic, all-powerful, centralized Government. And after almost a year the Federal power march continues. There had been an imperceptible gain in the very grave balance-of-payments problem but it was not at all certain that even these meager gains could be maintained. Meanwhile the raid on our gold reserves continued month after month. And after almost a year, there has been no improvement. Street demonstrations and violence continued in various parts of the country, and an uneasy fear brooded over the Nation. But let it be understood, here and now, there is no issue over peaceful demonstrations. The civil rights movement, or any other law-abiding movement with legitimate aims, has a fundamental right to exist in our Republic; what's more, it is so fundamental there appears little reason for any partisanship on the matter. Resort to violence is an entirely different matter. Political parties exist for a multitude of reasons, among the most important being public exploration and illumination of matters of great public concern. Therefore, I hope Johnson administration spokesmen lose no debating time on the right track, to wit: violence, disorder, crime, or running a traffic light, are all against the law, whether committed by men, women, or by students, or by white people, or Negro people, or by Irish, English, Scandinavian, or any other American.

The valid issue is this, as summed up by The Evening Star, Washington, D.C., on October 8: "On record is the (administration) leadership's procrastination in facing up to the problem, and such political ammunition as the Vice President's ill-considered statement that, were he forced to live in a ghetto, he would be right out there leading the riot."

V

Adherence to principles and actions for the public good was displayed in marked fashion during the past session and is worthy of note for the public record. But first, the Republican Leader would like to pay tribute to Members of his party for their devotion to duty and their diligence in carrying out their responsibilities on the various committees of the Senate. A glance at the record indicates Republicans showed a great degree of unity.

And to the Democratic Leader, Senator Mike Mansfield, I tender a salute for his gracious forbearance, for his kindness, for his constant cooperation, and for his unwavering respect for the rights and problems of the minority party. For this I cannot thank him enough.

We commend those Democrats who followed the Republicans last February in exposing and opposing the Johnson administration's "small business be damned attitude"—revealed by attempts to eliminate the independent Small Business Administration and have it swallowed up by the big Commerce Department. No Democrat disputed the charge. The independence of SBA was saved.

Early in the session it was apparent the administration intended to play an old game: present a deceptively "low" big budget by cutting necessary funds and letting Congress put them back and bear any blame for the deficit. The administration cut school lunch funds while fully aware the country would not stand for it. The administration's own Democratic-controlled Congress could take the blame for increasing the budget while the White House could appear with a halo for wanting to "save" money. This was blatantly unprincipled.

Actually, nothing could quench the inatissible desire of the administration to spend money for such things as studying why Australian aborigines sweat, the behavior of ostriches in Africa, sending 100,000 cans of women's hair spray to Vietnam, studying the love life of an octopus, and so on ad infinitum.

So we commend those who joined Republicans in stopping the administration's attempt to slash four-fifths of the school milk program and in preventing the President from drastically cutting the school lunch program. This was a strange paradox in view of Mr. Johnson's asking a billion-dollar food for freedom program for people abroad.

And we commend those who joined Republicans in saving land-grant colleges. Although Mr. Johnson maintained he was in favor of higher education he wanted to eliminate $11.85 million under the Morrill Act signed by Abraham Lincoln in 1862 to establish these colleges. On a national basis this would have meant the elimination of 1,200 college faculty members and 18,000 students.
And we commend those who joined Republicans in saving the federally impacted school fund program. This has been a 25-year program, originally provided under the Lanham Act passed during World War II.

And we commend those who joined Republicans in saving the loan program for medical students, nurses, and other medical personnel, as well as some funds under the National Defense Education Act.

And we commend those who joined Republicans in fighting the administration's betrayal of farmers in trying to withhold Farm Home Administration contingency funds. The same situation prevailed on research programs by Agricultural Experiment Stations.

It is reminiscent of how the administration early in the 1st session of the 89th Congress attempted to haphazardly close the loan program, originally provided under the Lanham Act passed during the administration of Dwight D. Eisenhower, and based on the latest figures of the Consumer Price Index, your grocery dollar has dropped to 84 cents today. By now everyone knows, or should know, the farmer isn't to blame and is actually worse off than a year ago.

The price of cornflakes soars again. One housewife is planning to buy two packages as soon as she can find a coupon. But it is no laughing matter. Since the end of the Republican administration of Dwight D. Eisenhower, and based on the latest (August) figures of the Consumer Price Index, your grocery dollar has dropped to 84 cents today. By now everyone knows, or should know, the farmer isn't to blame and is actually worse off than a year ago.

A quart of milk has gone up 12 percent.
A pound of hamburger has gone up 15 percent.
A pound of bacon has gone up 15 percent.
A pound of pork chops has gone up 25 percent.
A pound of fish has gone up 24 percent.

A loaf of bread costs 25 percent more today.
Your transportation dollar is now worth 86 cents.
Your medical care dollar is now worth 72 cents.
Your medical insurance dollar is now worth 86 cents.
Your housing dollar is now worth 84 cents.
Your apparel dollar is now worth 91 cents.
Your auto insurance dollar is now worth 62 cents.

A cartoon recently depicted the cost of living jump as a Great Society supermarket. Lamb prices were up $1,700 a ton. Bacon was up $1,100 a ton. Jelly was up $200 a ton. Off to one side of the counter, someone who looked like the President of the United States was whispering to his associates: "Keep reminding them how we held the steel increase to $2.50 a ton."

The following editorial from The Wall Street Journal of October 12, 1966, entitled "Think Cheap" adequately describes the cost of living and the administration approach to inflation.

**Think Cheap**

If there were any doubts that Washington considers the average consumer to be pretty dumb, they should be dispelled by the appearance of a six-page pamphlet, *Shopping Sense*, prepared by the committee in cooperation with the National Association of Food Chains which will make available at no cost several million copies to supermarkets where shoppers can pick them up. Plainly, then, the cost of predigested *Shopping Sense* in the end will be added to the housewife's food bill. "Socko."

"Think Cheap" is designed, according to Mrs. Esther Peterson, Chairman of the President's Committee on Consumer Interests, "to help consumers get the most for their food dollars at this time when there are rising prices."

Agreed that consumers, in these days of Government-generated inflation, need all the help they can get. What they may get from *Shopping Sense*, however, is about as much value as might be inspired by a typical episode of "Batman." It says that certain convenience foods—such as TV dinners and stuffed baked potatoes—cost more than their equivalent in fresh food items. *Batman*.

"Shopping Sense* advises the homemaker, for instance, to leave husband and children at home when they shop for food; husband and children are distracting influences. *Song*.

It says that certain convenience foods—such as TV dinners and stuffed baked potatoes—cost more than their equivalent in fresh food items. *Bat*.

The housewife should take along a shopping list, it says, but should be open-minded if she sees an unadvertised bargain. *Pow*.

Use substitutes, urges *Shopping Sense*. "For, says Mrs. Peterson, housewives "need to get off the old meat and potatoes routine." *Zonk*.

Try lower-priced brands and grades, the pamphlet urges. *Whammo*.

In other words, ladies, think cheap.

*Shopping Sense* was prepared by the committee in cooperation with the National Association of Food Chains which will make available at no cost several million copies to supermarkets where shoppers can pick them up. Plainly, then, the cost of predigested *Shopping Sense* in the end will be added to the housewife's food bill. *Socko*.

The authors of this message on thinking cheap are aiming it at the wrong audience. After all, it isn't the housewife who has been making price rises.
1. The cost of living has gone up significantly since the 1940s. In 1940, a family of three could buy a week's worth of groceries for $98.46. By August 1966, that same amount of money could only buy a third of the groceries. This was due to the cost of the cost of living index, which has increased.”

2. The median home price in the United States increased from $20,000 in 1965 to $21,400 in 1966. This represented an increase of $1,400 in one year. In July, the latest survey report, the median price was $21,400.

3. The number of nonfarm (mortgage) foreclosures in the United States totaled 116,004, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board reported. This was a drop of $1.85 per week compared to the previous year. Thus far this year, foreclosures have taken a big jump and are running at a rate equal to 222,212 a year.

4. In 1966, the factory worker with three dependents had a take-home pay of $98.46 a week. This was a drop of $1.43 per week since June. The "real spendable earnings" for workers have been going up according to the September 23, 1966, report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. In February 1965, "real spendable earnings" were $87.63 a week. In August 1965, they were down to $87.15. In August 1966, they were down to $86.52.

5. The latest Consumer Price Index released by the Bureau of Labor Statistics on September 23 showed the cost of living for August 1966. Since 1960 the cost of living has gone up 15.27 percent. Since 1960 the cost of groceries has jumped 13.75 percent. Since January, living costs in just 7 months have jumped 22.2 percent. And in the same 7 months, grocery costs have increased 2.95 percent.

6. If you put $800 away in a shoebox in 1940, you've lost $57 in purchasing power. If you put $1000 away in a shoebox in 1960, $0 of it already has been "stolen" in purchasing power. It now takes $22.42 to buy the groceries you could get for $20 just 6 years ago.

7. The 1933 dollar is now worth only 39.6 cents; the 1960 dollar, 91 cents. The 1940 dollar is worth 43 cents; the 1960 dollar, 91 cents.
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Republican Senators and Republican Members of the House of Representatives proposed programs in 1965 and 1966 covering every aspect of our daily domestic lives and our affairs abroad. It would take a book to list them; in addition, the Republican Coordinating Committee, representing every facet of Republicanism from national level to the grassroot, has offered detailed programs. These included:

Date proposed and program
June 1965, United States Foreign Policy in Vietnam.
September 1965, Equality in America: a Promise Unfulfilled.
December 1965, Toward a Stronger Federal System.
December 1965, Toward Fair Elections in America.
March 1966, Latin America-United States: Progress or Failure?
June 1966, Effective Water Management.
June 1966, Federal, State, and Local Responsibilities for Problems of Education.
June 1966, Transportation in Modern America.
June 1966, Housing and Urban Development.
June 1966, Jobs and People—Job Opportunities.

In recent weeks the White House has blamed the Congress for appropriating more than it asked in some cases. Again I point out it is the administration’s own Democratic-controlled Congress. But for the record, who is trying to save your tax dollar? Here are some examples:

6 economy rollcall votes in the Senate, 1966

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Proposed and Program</th>
<th>Republican Voting for Economy</th>
<th>Democratic Voting for Economy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 4, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 15, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 19, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 4, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 6, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 7, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 12, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 13, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 14, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 16, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 17, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 18, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 19, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 20, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 21, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 22, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 23, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 24, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 25, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 26, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 27, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 28, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 29, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 30, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 4, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 5, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 6, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 7, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 8, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 9, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 10, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 11, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 12, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 13, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 14, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 16, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 17, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 18, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 19, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 20, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 21, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 22, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 23, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 24, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 25, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 26, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 27, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 28, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 29, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 30, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 31, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 3, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 4, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 5, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 6, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 7, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 8, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 9, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 10, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 11, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 12, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 13, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 14, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 15, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 16, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 17, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 18, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 19, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 20, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 21, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 22, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 23, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 24, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 25, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 26, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 27, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 28, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 29, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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IX

"But now the squeeze is clearly on," reports The Atlantic Monthly for October in an article entitled "Consensus Policies: End of an Experiment." The article observes that the President’s salutary days are over. Sooner than later he is going to have to make some vital decisions because of "the rising cost of the war in human terms and in fortunes." What is more, the magazine says, "the world will not hold still for the Johnson treatment." The Atlantic Monthly also observed:

All year long the Administration has been walking the tightrope on a tax increases or a紧迫 calling of which would signal an end to domestic the failure to repeal 14(b); the farmers are blaming Freeman for allegedly trying to slow the rise in food prices; the the blind law to extend books and other materials to other handicapped to liberalize benefits to parents of veterans; 100 percent to give automobiles to certain cold war veterans who suffered serious service-connected disabilities; 100 percent support for a military pay raise; 100 percent to provide a coordinated national highway safety program.

Note—Strength in House: 293 Democrats versus 140 Republicans.

How did Republican Senators vote on some of the other issues in the 1st session of the 89th? Here are some samples:

Republican Senators voted 100 percent on auto tire safety standards; and 100 percent for the cold war GI benefits bill; and solidly in approval of legislation for more flexible farm credit; 100 percent for the dogs and cats humane and pet-keeping bill; 96 percent for a National Wild Rivers System; 84 percent for a plan to provide hard-pressed parents or students with some income tax credit for college tuition (Democrats defeated it); 100 percent in favor of a bill to expand library services and construction; 100 percent for the auto safety bill (S. 305).

Also: Republicans supported 100 percent a plan under the aid for the blind law to extend books and other materials to other handicapped persons; 100 percent to liberalize benefits to dependents of veterans, and to liberalize indemnitities to parents of veterans; 100 percent to give automobiles to certain cold war veterans who suffered serious service-connected disabilities; 100 percent support for a military pay raise; 100 percent to provide a coordinated national highway safety program.
Mr. Otten noted: "This does not sit well with Congress. Many Senators and Representatives feel the President cannot reasonably expect to have it both ways. Many have turned Mr. Johnson's two-edged argument to suit their own purposes, rather than his. If filing income taxes is as important as the Chief Executive says, most lawmakers can't see why they shouldn't take care of a few of their own constituency's needs along with the President's.* *

Alternatively, if the administration claims that it is doing better on poverty, then one wonders why its critics are focusing on an increase in the poverty level. Does this represent the ethics of a Great Society, or is it just another example of the Government's failure to fulfill its responsibilities?

In addition to the war, the rising tide of crime and violence in our streets, the highest cost of living in history, more and more home mortgage foreclosures, Government news management, a decrease in "real spendable earnings," loss of prestige abroad, and larger and larger Federal spending, there are also other matters of concern.

The administration raised interest rates on VA and FHA home loans to the highest in history this month.

Is this indicative of a Great Society?

The Government has paid interest rates 1,500 percent larger than ever before on some short-term loans. And interest rates on every- thing else from home loans, personal loans, installment loans, to loans made to corporations, have soared to the highest levels in 45 years.

Does this mark the progress of a Great Society?

There were more strikes and work stoppages in the first 6 months of 1966 than in any similar period in the last decade.

Will the administration point to this as a Great Society mark?

A multitude of scandals has burst upon the Federal scene from windfall profits in housing and the random issuance of bank charters to blatantly scores of program scandals.

Does this represent the ethics of a Great Society?

American taxpayers, whether they realize it or not, are saddled with $1 billion per month for interest alone on the national debt.

Does an ever-increasing public debt represent a Great Society?

From 1901 through 1965 American farmers had the lowest share of the Gross National Product; the lowest return on gross sales; the lowest return on total capital invest- ment; the lowest share of the food dollar; the lowest level of parity of income; and received the lowest performance on campaign promises ever made by an administration.

Does this represent the flowering of a Great Society?

Since December 1, 1965, when the administration made headlines about cutting the public payroll by 25,000, more than 227,000 additional employees have been placed on the public payroll by the Johnson administration.

Is this what is meant by a Great Society?
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The reporters were willing, but the hearings—most of them closed—revealed little or nothing. Fortunately, some of them were not closed. Wisconsin Representative Melvin Laird, chairman of the House Republican Conference, took the President at his word, Laird tried to do his homework by question-\ing Pentagon Comptroller Robert Anthony. "When I asked him where the Vietnam war cost estimates were that the President referred to," Laird said, "Anthony replied that there is nothing in the hearings that would tell you the cost of the war in Vietnam." In July, budget figures were released indicating the cost in fiscal 1966 was $5.8 billion, or about $500 million a month. In September, however, the Treasury acknowledged that the cost had soared to $1.3 billion a month. Even this much higher figure, though, is only the tip of the iceberg. Those closest to the situation privately admit that Congressman Laird's estimate of $2 billion a month is probably closer to the mark. Defense Secretary McNamara has said that "the incremental costs of South Vietnam" are about $1 billion a month, which would mean $12 billion a year. If Laird is right the cost will rise to at least $23 billion next year.

"The issue we are going to try to develop is the credibility of this administration as regards the war," Laird says, and he freely charges that "deception is being used on the amount of money being expended in Vietnam." The hard facts will have to come out soon, for the urgent need of coming to Congress for supplemental Vietnam funds, and the guessing is that they will exceed $10 billion, and possibly much more.

[From The Washington Star, October 9, 1966]

EISENHOWER URGES VICTORY BUT WOULDN'T USE NUCLEAR WEAPONS

BY MARVIN L. ARROWSMITH

GETTYSBURG, Pa.—Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower still insists "we must do whatever is necessary to win" that war in Vietnam. But he calls it silly for anyone to conclude this means to favor U.S. use of nuclear weapons there.

The five-star general who led allied forces to victory in Europe in World War II says it is an entirely different kind of war in Vietnam—a guerrilla-type campaign versus a professional foe, for all intents and purposes.

Only President Johnson, Eisenhower adds, ultimately can call the signals on this war.

Eisenhower says his only advice is that it might be a strategy aimed at winning quickly and pulling out to avoid loss of American lives—a strategy in which he does not think would involve Red Chinese intervention.

But to anyone who gets the idea—and some do—that in recent remarks he favored using nuclear weapons to achieve a swift victory, Eisenhower has this to say:

"This is silly. How would you use nuclear weapons in Vietnam? I ask: Do you have any idea what they would do in Vietnam? And do you have any idea what the President finds out he must do, I shall not criticize him. I do not know whether this war is going to escalate or de-escalate or anything else.

"I do know we must do whatever is necessary to win as quickly as possible. If not, the war will grow in costs, both in money and lives, and the Nation's morale will be lowered."

THE MORALE FACTOR

And he says:

"The morale of a nation is just as important a factor—probably a more important factor—in determining its capacity to lead as is its military or economic strength."

Eisenhower will observe his 76th birthday at his farm here Friday. The former president expects to follow luncheon proceedings with a speech to Congress on Vietnam and other matters.

"November 8 against their hopes. We are under fire— Buccellati administration policy in Vietnam. He thinks such an effort would be very risky from a political standpoint, and that putting the President in the position of taking new and inflation dangers would come to shape the political climate of the whole country."

For the aggressive win-the-war tactics he advocates, Eisenhower foresees no likelihood of a course bringing Red China or the Soviet Union into the conflict in full military support of the Communist North Vietnamese. He holds
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that some people always—and without justification—see bogeymen under the bed in such circumstances.

THE EARLIER STATEMENTS

Eisenhower doubts that either Communist China or the Soviet Union would feel they had anything to gain worth taking the risk.

Appreciation that Eisenhower might be advocating use of nuclear weapons in Vietnam was voiced in some quarters after remarks he made September 30 in Chicago and October 3 in Washington.

In Chicago, the former President seemed to imply that he would "take any action to win" in Vietnam. Asked then to elaborate, he replied:

"I'm not sure. I'm not familiar with all the political considerations. If they gave me the problem, I'd take any action to win."

In Washington 3 days later newsmen again sought amplification.

"I would do anything," said Eisenhower, "to bring the war to an honorable solution as rapidly as I could.

 Asked whether he would automatically preclude the use of nuclear weapons if he were President at this time, Eisenhower replied: "I would not automatically preclude the use of anything."

Eisenhower's remarks prompted Senate Democratic Leader Mike Mansfield to call on the former President to spell out just what he had in mind—to say specifically whether he was advocating use of nuclear weapons and—or—an increase in the U.S. manpower commitment to Vietnam. The Montana senator said the Nation's voters were entitled to know in this congressional election year.

Johnson, asked for comment on Eisenhower's remarks, told his news conference last week: "I would say it is the policy of this Government to exercise the best judgment of which we are capable in an attempt to provide the maximum de-terrence with a minimum of involvement. The easiest thing we could do is to go to war in Vietnam."

Johnston obviously was talking about the possibility of direct involvement of Red China and the Soviet Union.

At the time it was uttered Eisenhower took no public note of the criticism some Congress Members felt at him because of his remarks about taking any action needed to win in Vietnam.

The old soldier is known to feel intensely, however, that these Moons ought to remain silent on military strategy and tactics, and leave each matters to the President and his military advisers.

As for Johnson's news conference statement, Eisenhower would add—as Johnson has on other occasions—that U.S. military, political, and economic objectives ought to be achieved as swiftly as possible, and the war then ended to put a stop to U.S. casualties.

Eisenhower holds that whatever is necessary to win these U.S. goals must be done. And he holds, further, that Johnson will do it.
Dear Colleague:

For your information and assistance, I am enclosing a summary of a number of the Republican accomplishments during the Second Session of the 89th Congress. I believe that it reflects a record of real achievement.

In case after case, the Republican Members have been affirmative, imaginative, and effective. Opposition for the sake of opposition has not been a part of this record. We have, as the loyal opposition, given every majority proposal thoughtful but searching consideration. Whenever it was possible, we have tried to improve legislation through amendment or alternative proposals. We have, however, been strong in our opposition to all legislation that was not in the public interest, and quick to call attention to those matters that needed correction. This, I believe, is in the finest tradition of this great deliberative body and our two-party system.

It is my hope that you will find the record of accomplishment of House Republicans as reflected in this summary, helpful in electing you to serve in the 90th Congress.

Sincerely yours,

John J. Rhodes, M.C.
Saving the Small Business Administration

Under the Johnson-Humphrey Administration, the once-vital Small Business Administration that had been created as an independent agency in 1953 by a Republican President, was downgraded and nearly destroyed. The Office of Administrator was left vacant, the business loan program was gutted, and there were disturbing and recurrent rumors that this independent agency was to be transferred to the Commerce Department. Thanks to Republican efforts, this disastrous trend was reversed. In a series of statements and releases, the plan to eliminate the spokesman for small business in big government was exposed. As a result, the proposed transfer was killed, an Administrator was appointed and the loan functions were reactivated. (See February 23, 1966 Policy Committee statement.)

* * * *

Rescuing the Maritime Industry

For some unfathomable reason, the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has chosen to ignore our steadily deteriorating maritime industry. Our shipbuilding program is lagging, our World War II reserve fleet is growing older and the expanding war in Vietnam is putting the United States merchant fleet under tremendous pressure. Even so, the Administration's total maritime budget for 1967 set a 7-year low. While we have dropped to 12th place among the shipbuilding nations, Russia has risen from 12th to 7th place. Faced with this serious situation, the Republican members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the Republican Policy Committee set out to alert the American people to the perils of the Administration's course. Although we have been unable to reverse this trend entirely, some significant gains have been made. A bill that would establish the Maritime Administration as an independent agency has been reported from committee. Also, an attempt to bury the Maritime Administration in the newly-created Department of Transportation was defeated. Finally, the Appropriations Committee increased the funds for ship construction by $21.6 million.

Our national survival may depend upon the shipping that should be under construction but which the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has scuttled. Additional steps must be taken to correct this disastrous situation. If the present trend continues, this country that once boasted the greatest merchant fleet in the world will be left on history's shore waiting for ships that never come in. (See April 20, 1966 Policy Committee statement.)

* * * *

Protecting the American Public's Right-to-Know

In an effort to conceal and cover-up, Federal Agencies have adopted 24 ways to keep administrative information from public view. Bureaucratic gobbledygook used to deny access to information has included such gems as "Eyes Only," "Limited Official Use," "Confidential Treatment," and "Limitation on Availability of Equipment for Public Reference." In order to pierce this "paper curtain," Republican Members sponsored and worked hard for the adoption of Freedom of Information legislation.

Due to the opposition of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration, this proposal was bottled up in Committee for over a year. However, as a result of pressure from Republicans, publishers, and representatives of the press, radio and T.V., it was finally reported and enacted into law. Now, this legislation can help to blaze a

(more)
trail of truthfulness and accurate disclosure in what has become a jungle of falsification, unjustified secrecy, and misstatement by statistic. Hopefully, the saying "would you believe?" can once again become a line for comedians rather than government press officials.

(See May 18, 1966 Policy Committee statement.)

** * **

Urging Election and Campaign Contribution Reform Legislation

Republican Members have responded to one of the great challenges of our times - the reformation of our election and campaign contribution laws. In the past, there have been a number of excellent studies and reports on this subject. President Kennedy appointed a special Commission on Campaign Contributions, and in 1962 the report of this Commission sparked the introduction of several bills. President Johnson sent a message to Congress recommending that something be done but the Administration bill, which was finally introduced, proved to be defective and inadequate.

Alert to the importance of this legislation and the need for prompt action, the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives introduced an election reform bill that incorporated a number of the President's proposals, but also included many significant improvements and additions. For example, the Republican bill established a five-member Federal Elections Commission that would receive reports and statements regarding campaign contributions and expenditures and investigate allegations of wrongdoing. All contributions and expenditures of $100 or more would have to be reported. A $100 income tax deduction for campaign contributions is provided.

The Republican Members of the House Administration Committee pressed for and obtained Committee hearings and consideration of this bill. As a result, the Elections Subcommittee reported an Election Reform bill that contained many of the Republican suggestions. Every Republican Member of the Subcommittee voted for this bill and at the following meeting of the full Committee, all Republican Members were present and ready to vote to report the bill for immediate floor consideration. Unfortunately, the Democratic members would not join the Republicans. So, for this session, this important bill has been killed. However, in the public interest, this legislation must be enacted into law before the 1968 Presidential campaign. Republicans will press for its adoption during the next Congress. (See May 26, 1966 Policy Committee statement and Reprint of Congressional Record dated August 30, 1966.)

** * **

Assisting the Veterans

During the 89th Congress, action on two major veterans' bills resulted directly from Republican leadership.

The Republican-supported Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966 (PL 89-358) provided educational benefits for veterans of current military service. This essential legislation was enacted over the determined opposition of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration. For example, in March 1965, an Administration spokesman told a Senate Committee that enactment of such legislation would not be in accord with the program of the President. Again in September 1965, Administration spokesmen reiterated to a House Committee their opposition to pending veterans' education bills.

(more)
Recognizing the need for this legislation, the House Republican Policy Committee in June 1965 urged Congress to provide educational benefits for Vietnam veterans "as quickly as possible." Again in January 1966, the Policy Committee called for "the immediate enactment of a bill that will authorize a program of education and training for veterans of military service," and urged the Administration to support this legislation. Such a bill became law on March 3, 1966. The President, in approving the bill, said that he would sign it notwithstanding the fact that it went further than he was willing to ask for this year.

The Republican-supported Veterans' Pension Act of 1966 (H.R. 17488) provides an average 5.6 percent increase in monthly pension payments to 1.8 million veterans. As early as October 1965, Republican Members of the House were calling for hearings on proposals to liberalize the pension program. When hearings were held in July 1966, an Administration spokesman testified in opposition to all of the 188 pension bills pending in the House. After rejecting Republican-sponsored amendments to liberalize the bill by increasing the income limitations that control the monthly rate of pension, the Veterans' Affairs Committee reported H.R. 17488.

On September 14, 1966, the House Republican Policy Committee endorsed H.R. 17488, and criticized the Johnson-Humphrey Administration for the continued opposition to legislation that would provide a much-needed cost-of-living rate increase for veterans. At the same time, they called for an increase in the income limitations of the existing pension laws. (See January 26 and September 14, 1966 Policy Committee statements.)

Reorganizing Congress

On July 28, 1966, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress filed its final report with Congress. This report contained a number of important recommendations that would materially strengthen and modernize Congress. Concerned by the apparent decline of Congressional initiative and independence under the Johnson Administration, the Republican Policy Committee joined the Republican Members of the Joint Committee in urging the immediate consideration of the Committee recommendations. A bill entitled "The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1966, H.R. 17873," that would implement these recommendations was introduced by the ranking Republican Member of the Joint Committee. Republicans believe that if Congress is to be a more effective institution for carrying out its basic modern functions - legislative review, and representative - it must be updated. Authority that has been unwisely delegated to the executive must be regained. The continued dilution of its historic role must be stopped. However, this cannot take place until the organizational effectiveness and internal operation of Congress has been improved. The recommendations of the Joint Committee provide a giant step in the right direction.

The Republican Members of the House of Representatives long have been interested in Congressional reform. At the outset of this session of Congress, a task force of the House Republicans on Congressional Reform and Minoriy Staffing was appointed to study the matter of Congressional reform in depth. As a result of the work of this task force, a book entitled "We Propose: A Modern Congress" has been published. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this book were presented in full to the Joint Committee and many of the recommendations of the committee stemmed from the work of the task force. (See October 10, 1966 Policy Committee statement.)
Helping College Students

One of the most successful programs designed to help students complete their college education is the Student Loan Program of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Under this Republican-sponsored legislation, more than 968,000 students have borrowed $834 million.

This year, the very existence of this vital program was threatened by the Johnson-Humphrey Administration's recommendation that the program of direct loans to students by participating colleges be scaled back and finally terminated in favor of insured loans. Sensing that this course of action would be disastrous for the many students who depend upon the loans, the Republican Members of Congress insisted that the Student Loan Program be fully funded. Over the continued opposition of the Administration, this was done. As a result, nearly half-a-million students at 1,600 colleges and universities will be able to obtain loans and $179 million in federal funds will be allocated to the participating institutions for this purpose.

The wisdom of the Republican efforts on behalf of the student loan program has been underlined by recent events. One of the first casualties of the Johnson inflation and soaring interest rates was bank-made student loans. In many areas, banks have stopped accepting applications for government-backed student loans. The 6 percent interest rate on a student loan is no longer attractive when banks can charge their best credit risks 6 percent for short-term loans. If the Administration's attempt to sabotage the student loan program had not been blocked, many students today would be out of money, out of luck, and out of school.

* * * * *

Increasing Social Security Benefits

Republican Members of Congress have demanded that Social Security benefits should be increased now, not in January 1968 as belatedly proposed by President Johnson. This would have been the case if the Democratic majority in Congress had acted upon a Republican proposal that would have provided an automatic increase in benefits whenever there is a stated increase in the consumer price index.

Great Society spending, and the accompanying budget deficits, and certain labor settlements have spiraled living costs to a point where elderly citizens are hard-pressed to make ends meet. There are nearly 40 million retired Americans who do not enjoy the benefit of rising wages and income to cope with rising prices. They are painfully aware that the purchasing power of our currency has eroded so that the 1957-59 dollar is today worth 88 cents and the 1940 dollar is worth only 43 cents.

The Republican proposal would have provided an across-the-board 8 percent average increase in benefits effective January 1, 1967 for approximately 22 million elderly persons eligible for Social Security payments. It would have been financed from the Social Security fund reserves without raising the Social Security tax rate or the annual earnings base on which it is levied. The entire House Republican membership urged Congress to stay in session until a benefits increase could be worked out. Unfortunately, our pleas on behalf of the people hurt the most by inflation, were not heeded by the Democratic majority.

* * * * *

(more)
Strengthening P.L. 480 and the Food for Peace Program

In 1954, P.L. 480 was enacted into law under the leadership of President Eisenhower and by a Republican Congress. This is the cornerstone of "Food for Peace." It has meant the difference between life and death for millions of people in a world where much of the population is engaged in a race between food production and population growth. This year the Republican Members of the House of Representatives not only supported the extension of P.L. 480 but were instrumental in adding a number of amendments that improved the legislation as follows:

1. Congressional review of the operation and administration of the program was insured by limiting the extension to two years.
2. The basic concept of "friendly countries" was retained.
3. The effectiveness of the P.L. 480 Joint Congressional-Executive Advisory Committee was improved.
4. A 5-percent cash payment in title I sales agreements will be insisted upon when possible.
5. Food sold for foreign currencies will be identified as being provided through the generosity of the American people.
6. Technical assistance in friendly developing countries was expanded through a "farmer-to-farmer" program.

Over the determined opposition of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration, Republicans also were successful in obtaining a ban on subsidized sales to nations that trade with North Vietnam. Republicans believe that when Americans and their allies are fighting and dying in the defense of freedom, nations that trade with those with whom we are joined in combat should not receive special treatment and assistance. (See June 8 and September 27, 1966 Policy Committee statements.)

* * * * *

Updating and Improving the Unemployment Compensation Laws

Under the leadership of the Republican Members of the Ways and Means Committee, a bill was reported and passed by the House of Representatives that preserved the highly-successful system of autonomous State programs of unemployment insurance. In contrast to the Federal dictation and controls contained in the rejected Administration bill, the Republican-sponsored measure updated and improved the present law as follows:

1. Thirteen weeks of extended unemployment compensation is provided during periods of recession.
2. Coverage is extended to those workers who can be generally considered "regularly" employed and for whom there can be reasonable standards of availability for work.
3. Non-profit organizations are given the option of participating as "self-insurers."
4. The wage base is increased from $3,000 to $3,900 beginning in 1969 and to $4,200 beginning in 1972.

(more)
6.

5. A judicial review of determinations by the Secretary of Labor with respect to qualifications of State plans is provided.

The House rejection of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration bill and the acceptance of the Republican measure would have meant that the present program of unemployment compensation, while continuing to provide necessary and essential assistance to the involuntarily unemployed, would not become a federalized system that permits abuse and encourages the unemployed to remain idle the maximum period of time rather than accept suitable employment or enter training programs as quickly as possible. (See June 21, 1966 Policy Committee statement.)

* * * * *

Implementing Water Pollution Control Activities

Although the Federal Government has played a leading role in the improvement of our rivers and harbors, it was not until 1956 under the Eisenhower Administration that the first comprehensive Federal Water Pollution Control Act was enacted. This Act was a good beginning and laid a firm foundation for future action. However, to be completely successful, there had to be greater State financial participation in the construction of sewage treatment works. Thus, since 1959, the Republican Members of the Committee on Public Works have insisted that any increase in funds authorized for Federal grants must be used to accelerate needed construction by offering an inducement to the States to participate in the cost of treatment plants. The Water Pollution Control Act of 1966 that was supported by the Republican Members and enacted into law accepts this principle. It contains substantial inducements to the States to participate in the cost of projects under both the accelerated existing program and the proposed clean rivers program.

Through the adoption of a Republican amendment, this law also provides the foundation for future industrial pollution abatement. Under this measure, the Secretary of Interior is directed to conduct an appropriate study of methods for providing incentives to assist in the construction of facilities and works by industry. Tax incentives, as well as other methods of financial assistance, are provided. Seventy-percent Federal grants for research and demonstration projects for prevention of pollution of waters by industry are made available also.

Water pollution poses a serious problem that must be solved. The legislation sponsored and supported by the Republican Members of the House of Representatives will do a great deal to assist in finding a solution. Moreover, the States, cities and the communities will be encouraged to do their share in combating the common problem of water pollution. (See September 14, 1966 Policy Committee statement.)

* * * * *

Combating Federal Controls

When the Defense Production Act was brought to the House Floor for extension, the Democratic Members of the Banking and Currency Committee included in the legislation a provision that would give the President standby authority to impose consumer credit controls. Although faced with a serious inflationary situation, the 89th Congress under its Democrat leadership was either unwilling or unable to control the real cause of the inflationary problem - the Great Society spending. Instead, they sought to impose governmental controls as a means of stemming the inflationary tide.

(more)
The Republican Membership in the House of Representatives rejected and opposed this radical and unnecessary proposal. They recognized that in a period of rising inflation, it is the individual with a limited or fixed income that suffers the greatest hardship. Without question, the real casualty of such controls would be the family with substantial needs but moderate means. These individuals do not have the resources to pay cash or make a large downpayment when they purchase an automobile, a refrigerator, or some other household appliance.

Fortunately, a sufficient number of Democrat Members joined the Republicans and the standby authority to impose consumer credit controls was stricken from the legislation. In this instance, the control philosophy was voted down. Thus, extreme and unwarranted powers were kept from the hands of the very individuals whose spending policies have caused the inflationary problem.

(See June 14, 1966 Policy Committee statement.)

Fighting Waste, Bungling, and Scandal in the Poverty Program

During the past year, efforts by the Republican Members of the Education and Labor Committee to gather information which would be helpful in drafting effective anti-poverty legislation were handicapped at every turn. The Democrat majority on the Committee repeatedly promised a full-fledged study and was given $200,000 for this purpose. However, field hearings did not materialize and an ever-changing investigative staff was confused by changes in direction, cancelled trips, and recalls from investigations. The reports which were issued were sketchy and contained statistics and percentages rather than material needed to draft corrective legislation. Moreover, some reports were intentionally withheld from the Republican Members.

The hearings that were finally held on the anti-poverty legislation developed into an 8-day parade of Administration spokesmen and apologists for the poverty program. The Republican Members of the Education and Labor Committee recommended 62 witnesses who were knowledgeable in all aspects of the anti-poverty program. However, these recommendations were ignored and the hearings were abruptly terminated. When Chairman Powell of the Education and Labor Committee was asked why this had been done, his only reply was "Because I am the Chairman."

In spite of this arbitrary and woefully inadequate action, there was no real attempt made by the Democrat leadership to correct the many abuses and gross mistakes that plagued the present program and $1.75 billion for fiscal year 1967 was ultimately authorized.

Fortunately for the American public, the Republican Members of the Education and Labor Committee conducted an independent investigation of the poverty program. Abuse after abuse was documented and exposed. A solid basis for an overall reform of the anti-poverty program was established. In order to effectuate the essential reforms and changes, the Republicans introduced substitute legislation entitled the Republican Opportunity Crusade. Unfortunately, this bill and the reforms that it would impose, was rejected. However, a good start on an eventual clean-up of this scandal-ridden program has been made. Republicans will continue to press for needed controls and reforms in the next Congress.

(See July 19, 1966 Policy Committee statement.)
Improving Public Transportation

In supporting the establishment of a new Department of Transportation, the Republican Members of the House of Representatives continued the historic policy of the Republican Party of encouraging the development of American transportation. The need for better coordination among the various governmental agencies that deal with transportation has been apparent for many years. In his final budget message to Congress, President Eisenhower stated "A Department of Transportation should be established so as to bring together at Cabinet level the presently fragmented federal functions regarding transportation activities."

The Republican Members were concerned that in the Administration's rush to create a Department of Transportation certain safeguards and considerations might be overlooked. They found that the bill that was originally proposed by the Johnson-Humphrey Administration would have granted the Secretary of Transportation broad authority that invaded the policy-making authority of Congress. It would have scrambled the non-independent accident investigation functions of the CAB with the regulation and control of the airways. Also, the Maritime Administration would be buried deep within the bureaucracy of the new Department.

Due to Republican efforts, the legislation creating the new Department has corrected these defects in the original Administration bill. As a result, the Department of Transportation, as it has now been established, will be able to perform efficiently and effectively. (See August 10, 1966 Policy Committee statement.)

Attacking Tight Money Problems

Although the big company with a large net profit may have little trouble borrowing money, the individual who wants to buy a car, obtain a college loan, or purchase a home has a terrific problem due to the present inflationary situation. If he is lucky enough to find a lender, he may have to pay an extremely high rate of interest to obtain a loan. Long before the Johnson-Humphrey Administration was willing to even admit that a problem existed, the Republican Members of the House of Representatives recognized that the average person was being hurt in the present tight money market and set out on a course of action that would afford this individual meaningful relief.

They called for an immediate slash in non-defense, non-essential domestic spending - not just in regard to appropriations as the President urged, but also with respect to new Great Society program authorizations that trigger the appropriations process. They sought a reduction in point discounts on FHA and VA home financing through an administrative adjustment of rates to a more realistic level. Republicans opposed the enactment of the Sales Participation Act scheme, noting that a program of this type could only mean additional government competition for the already scarce investment dollar. (The Administration subsequently recognized its error in enacting this proposal and suspended the sale of participations.) Republican Members also called for the removal of Fannie Mae's $15,000 administrative limitation on purchases of mortgages under its secondary market operations. This, too, has been implemented by the Administration. Finally, in order to cool off competition for savings among the financial institutions, Republicans pressed for and obtained sound remedial legislation.

(more)
9.

It is unfortunate the Johnson-P Humphrey Administration has been slow to awaken to the dangers of this situation. Interest rates are now at the highest point that they have been in over 40 years. These high interest rates have added tremendously to the cost of financing the ever-mounting Federal debt. The rising demand for credit by the Federal Government and business has drawn credit away from credit-sensitive industries such as homebuilding. As a result, homebuilding and home buying, one of the Nation's largest industries, is now faced with a major crisis. Private housing starts in September were down 26 percent from September 1965. Applications for FHA-insured mortgages on existing homes were down 34 percent from a year ago.

In the next Congress, Republicans will continue to press for appropriate remedial action. They will do all they can to help the pensioner, the Social Security recipient, and the individual with a fixed income or a fixed wage who has become the forgotten man of the Great Society.

(See May 10, June 8, and July 27, 1966 Policy Committee statements.)

* * * * *

Maintaining Law and Order

Republicans of the 89th Congress have stood vigilant in protecting the public's interest in, and demand for, measures assuring increased protection for law and order in our society.

Of primary significance was the National Criminal Law Revision Commission bill introduced by Representative Poff (R-Va.) and twenty of his Republican colleagues in June of this year. This bill was drafted and introduced when the President's so-called "crime package" of legislation was found to be wanting. The Poff bill was substituted for an unimaginative proposal in the President's package, received bipartisan acclaim and support, and was passed by the House by a unanimous vote on September 6, 1966.

Republicans again answered the growing demand for increased responsibility in the streets and urban centers of our land when Representative Cramer (R-Fla.) proposed and won approval for an anti-riot measure. This measure prohibited the interstate travel of professional demonstrators and troublemakers. It ultimately prevailed over a watered-down Administration substitute but failed in the Senate. Subsequently, approximately eighty Members of the House, Republican and Democrat, introduced this anti-riot measure as separate legislation. Unfortunately, this legislation was bottled up in the Democrat-controlled Judiciary Committee and failed of passage before the end of the session.

In another and vital area of criminal law reform, the Narcotics Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966, House Republicans again remained vigilant to the cause of law and order. Republican-backed amendments were successful in turning back an Administration attempt to weaken the penalty structure of present law as it applies to sellers of narcotic drugs. Mandatory minimum sentences, which nearly all witnesses at the hearings had agreed upon as an effective deterrent to narcotics traffic, were thereby maintained to assist law enforcement officers in the war on narcotic traffickers.
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House Republican Accomplishments, Second Session, 89th Congress

Although outnumbered by more than two-to-one, Republicans in the Second Session of the 89th Congress have made a record of real achievement and remarkable unity.

In case after case, Republican Members have been affirmative, imaginative, and effective. Opposition for the sake of opposition has not been a part of this record. We have, as the loyal Opposition, given every majority proposal thoughtful but searching consideration. Whenever possible, we have tried to improve legislation through amendment or alternative proposals.

We have, however, been strong in our opposition to all legislation that was not in the public interest, and quick to call attention to those matters that needed correction. This, I believe, is in the finest tradition of our great deliberative body and our two-party system.

Republican accomplishments in 16 important areas are described briefly in the attached summary, which is by no means exhaustive.
I.

Saving the Small Business Administration

Under the Johnson-Humphrey Administration, the once-vital Small Business Administration that had been created as an independent agency in 1953 by a Republican President, was downgraded and nearly destroyed. The Office of Administrator was left vacant, the business loan program was gutted, and there were disturbing and recurrent rumors that this independent agency was to be transferred to the Commerce Department. Thanks to Republican efforts, this disastrous trend was reversed. In a series of statements and releases, the plan to eliminate the spokesman for small business in big government was exposed. As a result, the proposed transfer was killed, an Administrator was appointed and the loan functions were reactivated. (See February 23, 1966 Policy Committee statement.)

* * * *

Rescuing the Maritime Industry

For some unfathomable reason, the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has chosen to ignore our steadily deteriorating maritime industry. Our shipbuilding program is lagging, our World War II reserve fleet is growing older and the expanding war in Vietnam is putting the United States merchant fleet under tremendous pressure. Even so, the Administration's total maritime budget for 1967 set a 7-year low. While we have dropped to 12th place among the shipbuilding nations, Russia has risen from 12th to 7th place. Faced with this serious situation, the Republican members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the Republican Policy Committee set out to alert the American people to the perils of the Administration's course. Although we have been unable to reverse this trend entirely, some significant gains have been made. A bill that would establish the Maritime Administration as an independent agency has been reported from committee. Also, an attempt to bury the Maritime Administration in the newly-created Department of Transportation was defeated. Finally, the Appropriations Committee increased the funds for ship construction by $21.6 million.

Our national survival may depend upon the shipping that should be under construction but which the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has scuttled. Additional steps must be taken to correct this disastrous situation. If the present trend continues, this country that once boasted the greatest merchant fleet in the world will be left on history's shore waiting for ships that never come in. (See April 20, 1966 Policy Committee statement.)

* * * *

Protecting the American Public's Right-to-Know

In an effort to conceal and cover-up, Federal Agencies have adopted 24 ways to keep administrative information from public view. Bureaucratic gobbledygook used to deny access to information has included such gems as "Eyes Only," "Limited Official Use," "Confidential Treatment," and "Limitation on Availability of Equipment for Public Reference." In order to pierce this "paper curtain," Republican Members sponsored and worked hard for the adoption of Freedom of Information legislation. Due to the opposition of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration, this proposal was bottled up in Committee for over a year. However, as a result of pressure from Republicans, publishers, and representatives of the press, radio and T.V., it was finally reported and enacted into law. Now, this legislation can help to blaze a (more)
trail of truthfulness and accurate disclosure in what has become a jungle of falsification, unjustified secrecy, and misstatement by statistic. Hopefully, the saying “Would you believe?” can once again become a line for comedians rather than government press officials.

(See May 18, 1966 Policy Committee statement.)

* * * *

Urging Election and Campaign Contribution Reform Legislation

Republican Members have responded to one of the great challenges of our times - the reformation of our election and campaign contribution laws. In the past, there have been a number of excellent studies and reports on this subject. President Kennedy appointed a special Commission on Campaign Contributions, and in 1962 the report of this Commission sparked the introduction of several bills. President Johnson sent a message to Congress recommending that something be done but the Administration bill, which was finally introduced, proved to be defective and inadequate.

Alert to the importance of this legislation and the need for prompt action, the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives introduced an election reform bill that incorporated a number of the President's proposals, but also included many significant improvements and additions. For example, the Republican bill established a five-member Federal Elections Commission that would receive reports and statements regarding campaign contributions and expenditures and investigate allegations of wrongdoing. All contributions and expenditures of $100 or more would have to be reported. A $100 income tax deduction for campaign contributions is provided.

The Republican Members of the House Administration Committee pressed for and obtained Committee hearings and consideration of this bill. As a result, the Elections Subcommittee reported an Election Reform bill that contained many of the Republican suggestions. Every Republican Member of the Subcommittee voted for this bill and at the following meeting of the full Committee, all Republican Members were present and ready to vote to report the bill for immediate floor consideration. Unfortunately, the Democratic members would not join the Republicans. So, for this session, this important bill has been killed. However, in the public interest, this legislation must be enacted into law before the 1968 Presidential campaign. Republicans will press for its adoption during the next Congress.

(See May 26, 1966 Policy Committee statement and Reprint of Congressional Record dated August 30, 1966.)

* * * *

Assisting the Veterans

During the 89th Congress, action on two major veterans' bills resulted directly from Republican leadership.

The Republican-supported Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966 (PL 89-358) provided educational benefits for veterans of current military service. This essential legislation was enacted over the determined opposition of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration. For example, in March 1965, an Administration spokesman told a Senate Committee that enactment of such legislation would not be in accord with the program of the President. Again in September 1965, Administration spokesmen reiterated to a House Committee their opposition to pending veterans' education bills.

(more)
Recognizing the need for this legislation, the House Republican Policy Committee in June 1965 urged Congress to provide educational benefits for Vietnam veterans "as quickly as possible." Again in January 1966, the Policy Committee called for "the immediate enactment of a bill that will authorize a program of education and training for veterans of military service," and urged the Administration to support this legislation. Such a bill became law on March 3, 1966. The President, in approving the bill, said that he would sign it notwithstanding the fact that it went further than he was willing to ask for this year.

The Republican-supported Veterans' Pension Act of 1966 (H.R. 17488) provides an average 5.6 percent increase in monthly pension payments to 1.8 million veterans. As early as October 1965, Republican Members of the House were calling for hearings on proposals to liberalize the pension program. When hearings were held in July 1966, an Administration spokesman testified in opposition to all of the 188 pension bills pending in the House. After rejecting Republican-sponsored amendments to liberalize the bill by increasing the income limitations that control the monthly rate of pension, the Veterans' Affairs Committee reported H.R. 17488.

On September 14, 1966, the House Republican Policy Committee endorsed H.R. 17408, and criticized the Johnson-Humphrey Administration for the continued opposition to legislation that would provide a much-needed cost-of-living rate increase for veterans. At the same time, they called for an increase in the income limitations of the existing pension laws. (See January 26 and September 14, 1966 Policy Committee statements.)

Reorganizing Congress

On July 28, 1966, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress filed its final report with Congress. This report contained a number of important recommendations that would materially strengthen and modernize Congress. Concerned by the apparent decline of Congressional initiative and independence under the Johnson Administration, the Republican Policy Committee joined the Republican Members of the Joint Committee in urging the immediate consideration of the Committee recommendations. A bill entitled "The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1966, H.R. 17873," that would implement these recommendations was introduced by the ranking Republican Member of the Joint Committee. Republicans believe that if Congress is to be a more effective institution for carrying out its basic modern functions - legislative review, and representative - it must be updated. Authority that has been unwisely delegated to the executive must be regained. The continued dilution of its historic role must be stopped. However, this cannot take place until the organizational effectiveness and internal operation of Congress has been improved. The recommendations of the Joint Committee provide a giant step in the right direction.

The Republican Members of the House of Representatives long have been interested in Congressional reform. At the outset of this session of Congress, a task force of the House Republicans on Congressional Reform and "Minority Staffing was appointed to study the matter of Congressional reform in depth. As a result of the work of this task force, a book entitled "We Propose: A Modern Congress" has been published. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this book were presented in full to the Joint Committee and many of the recommendations of the committee stemmed from the work of the task force. (See October 10, 1966 Policy Committee statement.)
Helping College Students

One of the most successful programs designed to help students complete their college education is the Student Loan Program of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Under this Republican-sponsored legislation, more than 968,000 students have borrowed $834 million.

This year, the very existence of this vital program was threatened by the Johnson-Humphrey Administration’s recommendation that the program of direct loans to students by participating colleges be scaled back and finally terminated in favor of insured loans. Sensing that this course of action would be disastrous for the many students who depend upon the loans, the Republican Members of Congress insisted that the Student Loan Program be fully funded. Over the continued opposition of the Administration, this was done. As a result, nearly half-a-million students at 1,600 colleges and universities will be able to obtain loans and $179 million in federal funds will be allocated to the participating institutions for this purpose.

The wisdom of the Republican efforts on behalf of the student loan program has been underlined by recent events. One of the first casualties of the Johnson inflation and soaring interest rates was bank-made student loans. In many areas, banks have stopped accepting applications for government-backed student loans. The 6 percent interest rate on a student loan is no longer attractive when banks can charge their best credit risks 6 percent for short-term loans. If the Administration’s attempt to sabotage the student loan program had not been blocked, many students today would be out of money, out of luck, and out of school.

* * * * *

Increasing Social Security Benefits

Republican Members of Congress have demanded that Social Security benefits should be increased now, not in January 1968 as belatedly proposed by President Johnson. This would have been the case if the Democratic majority in Congress had acted upon a Republican proposal that would have provided an automatic increase in benefits whenever there is a stated increase in the consumer price index.

Great Society spending, and the accompanying budget deficits, and certain labor settlements have spiraled living costs to a point where elderly citizens are hard-pressed to make ends meet. There are nearly 40 million retired Americans who do not enjoy the benefit of rising wages and income to cope with rising prices. They are painfully aware that the purchasing power of our currency has eroded so that the 1957-59 dollar is today worth 88 cents and the 1940 dollar is worth only 43 cents.

The Republican proposal would have provided an across-the-board 8 percent average increase in benefits effective January 1, 1967 for approximately 22 million elderly persons eligible for Social Security payments. It would have been financed from the Social Security fund reserves without raising the Social Security tax rate or the annual earnings base on which it is levied. The entire House Republican membership urged Congress to stay in session until a benefits increase could be worked out. Unfortunately, our pleas on behalf of the people hurt the most by inflation, were not heeded by the Democratic majority.

* * * * *(more)*
Strengthening P.L. 480 and the Food for Peace Program

In 1954, P.L. 480 was enacted into law under the leadership of President Eisenhower and by a Republican Congress. This is the cornerstone of "Food for Peace." It has meant the difference between life and death for millions of people in a world where much of the population is engaged in a race between food production and population growth. This year the Republican Members of the House of Representatives not only supported the extension of P.L. 480 but were instrumental in adding a number of amendments that improved the legislation as follows:

1. Congressional review of the operation and administration of the program was insured by limiting the extension to two years.
2. The basic concept of "friendly countries" was retained.
3. The effectiveness of the P.L. 480 Joint Congressional-Executive Advisory Committee was improved.
4. A 5-percent cash payment in title I sales agreements will be insisted upon when possible.
5. Food sold for foreign currencies will be identified as being provided through the generosity of the American people.
6. Technical assistance in friendly developing countries was expanded through a "farmer-to-farmer" program.

Over the determined opposition of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration, Republicans also were successful in obtaining a ban on subsidized sales to nations that trade with North Vietnam. Republicans believe that when Americans and their allies are fighting and dying in the defense of freedom, nations that trade with those with whom we are joined in combat should not receive special treatment and assistance (See June 8 and September 27, 1966 Policy Committee statements.)

*** *** ***

Updating and Improving the Unemployment Compensation Laws

Under the leadership of the Republican Members of the Ways and Means Committee, a bill was reported and passed by the House of Representatives that preserved the highly-successful system of autonomous State programs of unemployment insurance. In contrast to the Federal dictation and controls contained in the rejected Administration bill, the Republican-sponsored measure updated and improved the present law as follows:

1. Thirteen weeks of extended unemployment compensation is provided during periods of recession.
2. Coverage is extended to those workers who can be generally considered "regularly" employed and for whom there can be reasonable standards of availability for work.
3. Non-profit organizations are given the option of participating as "self-insurers."
4. The wage base is increased from $3,000 to $3,900 beginning in 1969 and to $4,200 beginning in 1972.
5. A judicial review of determinations by the Secretary of Labor with respect to qualifications of State plans is provided.

The House rejection of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration bill and the acceptance of the Republican measure would have meant that the present program of unemployment compensation, while continuing to provide necessary and essential assistance to the involuntarily unemployed, would not become a federalized system that permits abuse and encourages the unemployed to remain idle the maximum period of time rather than accept suitable employment or enter training programs as quickly as possible. (See June 21, 1966 Policy Committee statement.)

Implementing Water Pollution Control Activities

Although the Federal Government has played a leading role in the improvement of our rivers and harbors, it was not until 1956 under the Eisenhower Administration that the first comprehensive Federal Water Pollution Control Act was enacted. This Act was a good beginning and laid a firm foundation for future action. However, to be completely successful, there had to be greater State financial participation in the construction of sewage treatment works. Thus, since 1959, the Republican Members of the Committee on Public Works have insisted that any increase in funds authorized for Federal grants must be used to accelerate needed construction by offering an inducement to the States to participate in the cost of treatment plants. The Water Pollution Control Act of 1966 that was supported by the Republican Members and enacted into law accepts this principle. It contains substantial inducements to the States to participate in the cost of projects under both the accelerated existing program and the proposed clean rivers program.

Through the adoption of a Republican amendment, this law also provides the foundation for future industrial pollution abatement. Under this measure, the Secretary of Interior is directed to conduct an appropriate study of methods for providing incentives to assist in the construction of facilities and works by industry. Tax incentives, as well as other methods of financial assistance, are provided. Seventy-percent Federal grants for research and demonstration projects for prevention of pollution of waters by industry are made available also.

Water pollution poses a serious problem that must be solved. The legislation sponsored and supported by the Republican Members of the House of Representatives will do a great deal to assist in finding a solution. Moreover, the States, cities and the communities will be encouraged to do their share in combatting the common problem of water pollution. (See September 14, 1966 Policy Committee statement.)

Combatting Federal Controls

When the Defense Production Act was brought to the House Floor for extension, the Democratic Members of the Banking and Currency Committee included in the legislation a provision that would give the President standby authority to impose consumer credit controls. Although faced with a serious inflationary situation, the 89th Congress under its Democrat leadership was either unwilling or unable to control the real cause of the inflationary problem – the Great Society spending. Instead, they sought to impose governmental controls as a means of stemming the inflationary tide. (more)
The Republican Membership in the House of Representatives rejected and opposed this radical and unnecessary proposal. They recognized that in a period of rising inflation, it is the individual with a limited or fixed income that suffers the greatest hardship. Without question, the real casualty of such controls would be the family with substantial needs but moderate means. These individuals do not have the resources to pay cash or make a large downpayment when they purchase an automobile, a refrigerator, or some other household appliance.

Fortunately, a sufficient number of Democrat Members joined the Republicans and the standby authority to impose consumer credit controls was stricken from the legislation. In this instance, the control philosophy was voted down. Thus, extreme and unwarranted powers were kept from the hands of the very individuals whose spending policies have caused the inflationary problem. (See June 14, 1966 Policy Committee statement.)

* * * *

Fighting Waste, Bungling, and Scandal in the Poverty Program

During the past year, efforts by the Republican Members of the Education and Labor Committee to gather information which would be helpful in drafting effective anti-poverty legislation were hampered and handicapped at every turn. The Democrat majority on the Committee repeatedly promised a full-fledged study and was given $200,000 for this purpose. However, field hearings did not materialize and an ever-changing investigative staff was confused by changes in direction, cancelled trips, and recalls from investigations. The reports which were issued were sketchy and contained statistics and percentages rather than material needed to draft corrective legislation. Moreover, some reports were intentionally withheld from the Republican Members.

The hearings that were finally held on the anti-poverty legislation developed ... into an 8-day parade of Administration spokesmen and apologists for the poverty program. The Republican Members of the Education and Labor Committee recommended 62 witnesses who were knowledgeable in all aspects of the anti-poverty program. However, these recommendations were ignored and the hearings were abruptly terminated. When Chairman Powell of the Education and Labor Committee was asked why this had been done, his only reply was "because I am the Chairman."

In spite of this arbitrary and woefully inadequate action, there was no real attempt made by the Democrat leadership to correct the many abuses and gross mistakes that plagued the present program and $1.75 billion for fiscal year 1967 was ultimately authorized.

Fortunately for the American public, the Republican Members of the Education and Labor Committee conducted an independent investigation of the poverty program. Abuse after abuse was documented and exposed. A solid basis for an overall reform of the anti-poverty program was established. In order to effectuate the essential reforms and changes, the Republicans introduced substitute legislation entitled the Republican Opportunity Crusade. Unfortunately, this bill and the reforms that it would impose, was rejected. However, a good start on an eventual clean-up of this scandal-ridden program has been made. Republicans will continue to press for needed controls and reforms in the next Congress. (See July 19, 1966 Policy Committee statement.)
Improving Public Transportation

In supporting the establishment of a new Department of Transportation, the Republican Members of the House of Representatives continued the historic policy of the Republican Party of encouraging the development of American transportation. The need for better coordination among the various governmental agencies that deal with transportation has been apparent for many years. In his final budget message to Congress, President Eisenhower stated "A Department of Transportation should be established so as to bring together at Cabinet level the presently fragmented federal functions regarding transportation activities."

The Republican Members were concerned that in the Administration's rush to create a Department of Transportation certain safeguards and considerations might be overlooked. They found that the bill that was originally proposed by the Johnson-Humphrey Administration would have granted the Secretary of Transportation broad authority that invaded the policy-making authority of Congress. It would have scrambled the now-independent accident investigation functions of the CAB with the regulation and control of the airways. Also, the Maritime Administration would be buried deep within the bureaucracy of the new Department.

Due to Republican efforts, the legislation creating the new Department has corrected these defects in the original Administration bill. As a result, the Department of Transportation, as it has now been established, will be able to perform efficiently and effectively.

(See August 10, 1966 Policy Committee statement.)

* * * *

Attacking Tight Money Problems

Although the big company with a large net profit may have little trouble borrowing money, the individual who wants to buy a car, obtain a college loan, or purchase a home has a terrific problem due to the present inflationary situation. If he is lucky enough to find a lender, he may have to pay an extremely high rate of interest to obtain a loan. Long before the Johnson-Humphrey Administration was willing to even admit that a problem existed, the Republican Members of the House of Representatives recognized that the average person was being hurt in the present tight money market and set out on a course of action that would afford this individual meaningful relief.

They called for an immediate slash in non-defense, non-essential domestic spending - not just in regard to appropriations as the President urged, but also with respect to new Great Society program authorizations that trigger the appropriations process. They sought a reduction in point discounts on FHA and VA home financing through an administrative adjustment of rates to a more realistic level. Republicans opposed the enactment of the Sales Participation Act scheme, noting that a program of this type could only mean additional government competition for the already scarce investment dollar. (The Administration subsequently recognized its error in enacting this proposal and suspended the sale of participations.) Republican Members also called for the removal of Fannie Mae's $15,000 administrative limitation on purchases of mortgages under its secondary market operations. This, too, has been implemented by the Administration. Finally, in order to cool off competition for savings among the financial institutions, Republicans pressed for and obtained sound remedial legislation.

(more)
9.

It is unfortunate the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has been slow to awaken to the dangers of this situation. Interest rates are now at the highest point that they have been in over 40 years. These high interest rates have added tremendously to the cost of financing the ever-mounting Federal debt. The rising demand for credit by the Federal Government and business has drawn credit away from credit-sensitive industries such as homebuilding. As a result, homebuilding and home buying, one of the Nation's largest industries, is now faced with a major crisis. Private housing starts in September were down 26 percent from September 1965. Applications for FHA-insured mortgages on existing homes were down 34 percent from a year ago.

In the next Congress, Republicans will continue to press for appropriate remedial action. They will do all they can to help the pensioner, the Social Security recipient, and the individual with a fixed income or a fixed wage who has become the forgotten man of the Great Society. (See May 10, June 8, and July 27, 1966 Policy Committee statements.)

Maintaining Law and Order

Republicans of the 89th Congress have stood vigilant in protecting the public's interest in, and demand for, measures assuring increased protection for law and order in our society.

Of primary significance was the National Criminal Law Revision Commission bill introduced by Representative Poff (R.-Va.) and twenty of his Republican colleagues in June of this year. This bill was drafted and introduced when the President's so-called 'crime package' of legislation was found to be wanting. The Poff bill was substituted for an unimaginative proposal in the President's package, received bipartisan acclaim and support, and was passed by the House by a unanimous vote on September 6, 1966.

Republicans again answered the growing demand for increased responsibility in the streets and urban centers of our land when Representative Cramer (R.-Fla.) proposed and won approval for an anti-riot measure. This measure prohibited the interstate travel of professional demonstrators and troublemakers. It ultimately prevailed over a watered-down Administration substitute but failed in the Senate. Subsequently, approximately eighty Members of the House, Republican and Democrat, introduced this anti-riot measure as separate legislation. Unfortunately, this legislation was bottled up in the Democrat-controlled Judiciary Committee and failed of passage before the end of the session.

In another and vital area of criminal law reform, the Narcotics Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966, House Republicans again remained vigilant to the cause of law and order. Republican-backed amendments were successful in turning back an Administration attempt to weaken the penalty structure of present law as it applies to sellers of narcotic drugs. Mandatory minimum sentences, which nearly all witnesses at the hearings had agreed upon as an effective deterrent to narcotics traffic, were thereby maintained to assist law-enforcement officers in the war on narcotic traffickers.
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House Republican Accomplishments, Second Session, 99th Congress

Although outnumbered by more than two-to-one, Republicans in the Second Session of the 89th Congress have made a record of real achievement and remarkable unity.

In case after case, Republican Members have been affirmative, imaginative, and effective. Opposition for the sake of opposition has not been a part of this record. We have, as the loyal opposition, given every majority proposal thoughtful but searching consideration. Whenever possible, we have tried to improve legislation through amendment or alternative proposal.

We have, however, been strong in our opposition to all legislation that was not in the public interest, and quick to call attention to those matters that needed correction. This, I believe, is in the finest tradition of our great deliberative body and our two-party system.

Republican accomplishments in 15 important areas are described briefly in the attached summary, which is by no means exhaustive.
1.

**Saving the Small Business Administration**

Under the Johnson-Humphrey Administration, the once-vital Small Business Administration that had been created as an independent agency in 1953 by a Republican President, was downgraded and nearly destroyed. The Office of Administrator was left vacant, the business loan program was gutted, and there were disturbing and recurrent rumors that this independent agency was to be transferred to the Commerce Department. Thanks to Republican efforts, this disastrous trend was reversed. In a series of statements and releases, the plan to eliminate the spokesman for small business in big government was exposed. As a result, the proposed transfer was killed, an Administrator was appointed and the loan functions were reactivated. (See February 23, 1966 Policy Committee statement.)

* * * *

**Rescuing the Maritime Industry**

For some unfathomable reason, the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has chosen to ignore our steadily deteriorating maritime industry. Our shipbuilding program is lagging, our World War II reserve fleet is growing older and the expanding war in Vietnam is putting the United States merchant fleet under tremendous pressure. Even so, the Administration's total maritime budget for 1967 set a 7-year low. While we have dropped to 12th place among the shipbuilding nations, Russia has risen from 12th to 7th place. Faced with this serious situation, the Republican members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the Republican Policy Committee set out to alert the American people to the perils of the Administration's course. Although we have been unable to reverse this trend entirely, some significant gains have been made. A bill that would establish the Maritime Administration as an independent agency has been reported from committee. Also, an attempt to bury the Maritime Administration in the newly-created Department of Transportation was defeated. Finally, the Appropriations Committee increased the funds for ship construction by $21.6 million.

Our national survival may depend upon the shipping that should be under construction but which the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has scuttled. Additional steps must be taken to correct this disastrous situation. If the present trend continues, this country that once boasted the greatest merchant fleet in the world will be left on history's shore waiting for ships that never come in. (See April 20, 1966 Policy Committee statement.)

* * * *

**Protecting the American Public's Right-to-Know**

In an effort to conceal and cover-up, Federal Agencies have adopted 24 ways to keep administrative information from public view. Bureaucratic gobbledygook used to deny access to information has included such gems as "Eyes Only," "Limited Official Use," "Confidential Treatment," and "Limitation on Availability of Equipment for Public Reference." In order to pierce this "paper curtain," Republican Members sponsored and worked hard for the adoption of Freedom of Information legislation.

Due to the opposition of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration, this proposal was bottled up in Committee for over a year. However, as a result of pressure from Republicans, publishers, and representatives of the press, radio and T.V., it was finally reported and enacted into law. Now, this legislation can help to blaze a (more)
trail of truthfulness and accurate disclosure in what has become a jungle of falsification, unjustified secrecy, and misstatement by statistic. Hopefully, the saying "Would you believe?" can once again become a line for comedians rather than government press officials.

(See May 18, 1966 Policy Committee statement.)

* * * * *

**Urging Election and Campaign Contribution Reform Legislation**

Republican Members have responded to one of the great challenges of our times - the reformation of our election and campaign contribution laws. In the past, there have been a number of excellent studies and reports on this subject. President Kennedy appointed a special Commission on Campaign Contributions, and in 1962 the report of this Commission sparked the introduction of several bills. President Johnson sent a message to Congress recommending that something be done but the Administration bill, which was finally introduced, proved to be defective and inadequate.

Alert to the importance of this legislation and the need for prompt action, the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives introduced an election reform bill that incorporated a number of the President's proposals, but also included many significant improvements and additions. For example, the Republican bill established a five-member Federal Elections Commission that would receive reports and statements regarding campaign contributions and expenditures and investigate allegations of wrongdoing. All contributions and expenditures of $100 or more would have to be reported. A $100 income tax deduction for campaign contributions is provided.

The Republican Members of the House Administration Committee pressed for and obtained Committee hearings and consideration of this bill. As a result, the Elections Subcommittee reported an Election Reform bill that contained many of the Republican suggestions. Every Republican Member of the Subcommittee voted for this bill and at the following meeting of the full Committee, all Republican Members were present and ready to vote to report the bill for immediate floor consideration. Unfortunately, the Democratic members would not join the Republicans. So, for this session, this important bill has been killed. However, in the public interest, this legislation must be enacted into law before the 1968 Presidential campaign. Republicans will press for its adoption during the next Congress.

(See May 26, 1966 Policy Committee statement and Reprint of Congressional Record dated August 30, 1966.)

* * * * *

**Assisting the Veterans**

During the 89th Congress, action on two major veterans' bills resulted directly from Republican leadership.

The Republican-supported Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966 (PL 89-358) provided educational benefits for veterans of current military service. This essential legislation was enacted over the determined opposition of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration. For example, in March 1965, an Administration spokesman told a Senate Committee that enactment of such legislation would not be in accord with the program of the President. Again in September 1965, Administration spokesmen reiterated to a House Committee their opposition to pending veterans' education bills.

(more)
Recognizing the need for this legislation, the House Republican Policy Committee in June 1965 urged Congress to provide educational benefits for Vietnam veterans "as quickly as possible." Again in January 1966, the Policy Committee called for "the immediate enactment of a bill that will authorize a program of education and training for veterans of military service," and urged the Administration to support this legislation. Such a bill became law on March 3, 1966. The President, in approving the bill, said that he would sign it notwithstanding the fact that it went further than he was willing to ask for this year.

The Republican-supported Veterans' Pension Act of 1966 (H.R. 17488) provides an average 5.6 percent increase in monthly pension payments to 1.6 million veterans. As early as October 1965, Republican Members of the House were calling for hearings on proposals to liberalize the pension program. When hearings were held in July 1966, an Administration spokesman testified in opposition to all of the 188 pension bills pending in the House. After rejecting Republican-sponsored amendments to liberalize the bill by increasing the income limitations that control the monthly rate of pension, the Veterans' Affairs Committee reported H.R. 17488.

On September 14, 1966, the House Republican Policy Committee endorsed H.R. 17488, and criticized the Johnson-Humphrey Administration for the continued opposition to legislation that would provide a much-needed cost-of-living rate increase for veterans. At the same time, they called for an increase in the income limitations of the existing pension laws. (See January 26 and September 14, 1966 Policy Committee statements.)

* * * * *

Reorganizing Congress

On July 28, 1966, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress filed its final report with Congress. This report contained a number of important recommendations that would materially strengthen and modernize Congress. Concerned by the apparent decline of Congressional initiative and independence under the Johnson Administration, the Republican Policy Committee joined the Republican Members of the Joint Committee in urging the immediate consideration of the Committee recommendations. A bill entitled "The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1966, H.R. 17873," that would implement these recommendations was introduced by the ranking Republican Member of the Joint Committee. Republicans believe that if Congress is to be a more effective institution for carrying out its basic modern functions - legislative review, and representative - it must be updated. Authority that has been unwisely delegated to the executive must be regained. The continued dilution of its historic role must be stopped. However, this cannot take place until the organizational effectiveness and internal operation of Congress has been improved. The recommendations of the Joint Committee provide a giant step in the right direction.

The Republican Members of the House of Representatives long have been interested in Congressional reform. At the outset of this session of Congress, a task force of the House Republicans on Congressional Reform and 'Minority Staffing was appointed to study the matter of Congressional reform in depth. As a result of the work of this task force, a book entitled "We Propose: A Modern Congress" has been published. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this book were presented in full to the Joint Committee and many of the recommendations of the committee stemmed from the work of the task force. (See October 10, 1966 Policy Committee statement.)
Helping College Students

One of the most successful programs designed to help students complete their college education is the Student Loan Program of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Under this Republican-sponsored legislation, more than 968,000 students have borrowed $834 million.

This year, the very existence of this vital program was threatened by the Johnson-Humphrey Administration's recommendation that the program of direct loans to students by participating colleges be scaled back and finally terminated in favor of insured loans. Sensing that this course of action would be disastrous for the many students who depend upon the loans, the Republican Members of Congress insisted that the Student Loan Program be fully funded. Over the continued opposition of the Administration, this was done. As a result, nearly half-a-million students at 1,600 colleges and universities will be able to obtain loans and $179 million in federal funds will be allocated to the participating institutions for this purpose.

The wisdom of the Republican efforts on behalf of the student loan program has been underlined by recent events. One of the first casualties of the Johnson inflation and soaring interest rates was bank-made student loans. In many areas, banks have stopped accepting applications for government-backed student loans. The 6 percent interest rate on a student loan is no longer attractive when banks can charge their best credit risks 6 percent for short-term loans. If the Administration's attempt to sabotage the student loan program had not been blocked, many students today would be out of money, out of luck, and out of school.

* * * * *

Increasing Social Security Benefits

Republican Members of Congress have demanded that Social Security benefits should be increased now, not in January 1968 as belatedly proposed by President Johnson. This would have been the case if the Democratic majority in Congress had acted upon a Republican proposal that would have provided an automatic increase in benefits whenever there is a stated increase in the consumer price index.

Great Society spending, and the accompanying budget deficits, and certain labor settlements have spiraled living costs to a point where elderly citizens are hard-pressed to make ends meet. There are nearly 40 million retired Americans who do not enjoy the benefit of rising wages and income to cope with rising prices. They are painfully aware that the purchasing power of our currency has eroded so that the 1957-59 dollar is today worth 88 cents and the 1940 dollar is worth only 43 cents.

The Republican proposal would have provided an across-the-board 8 percent average increase in benefits effective January 1, 1967 for approximately 22 million elderly persons eligible for Social Security payments. It would have been financed from the Social Security fund reserves without raising the Social Security tax rate or the annual earnings base on which it is levied. The entire House Republican membership urged Congress to stay in session until a benefits increase could be worked out. Unfortunately, our pleas on behalf of the people hurt the most by inflation, were not heeded by the Democratic majority.

* * * * *

(more)
Strengthening P.L. 480 and the Food for Peace Program

In 1954, P.L. 480 was enacted into law under the leadership of President Eisenhower and by a Republican Congress. This is the cornerstone of "Food for Peace." It has meant the difference between life and death for millions of people in a world where much of the population is engaged in a race between food production and population growth. This year the Republican Members of the House of Representatives not only supported the extension of P.L. 480 but were instrumental in adding a number of amendments that improved the legislation as follows:

1. Congressional review of the operation and administration of the program was insured by limiting the extension to two years.
2. The basic concept of "friendly countries" was retained.
3. The effectiveness of the P.L. 480 Joint Congressional-Executive Advisory Committee was improved.
4. A 5-percent cash payment in title I sales agreements will be insisted upon when possible.
5. Food sold for foreign currencies will be identified as being provided through the generosity of the American people.
6. Technical assistance in friendly developing countries was expanded through a "farmer-to-farmer" program.

Over the determined opposition of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration, Republicans also were successful in obtaining a ban on subsidized sales to nations that trade with North Vietnam. Republicans believe that when Americans and their allies are fighting and dying in the defense of freedom, nations that trade with those with whom we are joined in combat should not receive special treatment and assistance. (See June 8 and September 27, 1966 Policy Committee statements.)

* * * *

Updating and Improving the Unemployment Compensation Laws

Under the leadership of the Republican Members of the Ways and Means Committee, a bill was reported and passed by the House of Representatives that preserved the highly-successful system of autonomous State programs of unemployment insurance. In contrast to the Federal dictation and controls contained in the rejected Administration bill, the Republican-sponsored measure updated and improved the present law as follows:

1. Thirteen weeks of extended unemployment compensation is provided during periods of recession.
2. Coverage is extended to those workers who can be generally considered "regularly" employed and for whom there can be reasonable standards of availability for work.
3. Non-profit organizations are given the option of participating as "self-insurers."
4. The wage base is increased from $3,000 to $3,900 beginning in 1969 and to $4,200 beginning in 1972.

(more)
5. A judicial review of determinations by the Secretary of Labor with respect to qualifications of State plans is provided.

The House rejection of the Johnson-R Humphrey Administration bill and the acceptance of the Republican measure would have meant that the present program of unemployment compensation, while continuing to provide necessary and essential assistance to the involuntarily unemployed, would not become a federalized system that permits abuse and encourages the unemployed to remain idle the maximum period of time rather than accept suitable employment or enter training programs as quickly as possible. (See June 21, 1966 Policy Committee statement.)

Implementing Water Pollution Control Activities

Although the Federal Government has played a leading role in the improvement of our rivers and harbors, it was not until 1956 under the Eisenhower Administration that the first comprehensive Federal Water Pollution Control Act was enacted. This Act was a good beginning and laid a firm foundation for future action. However, to be completely successful, there had to be greater State financial participation in the construction of sewage treatment works. Thus, since 1959, the Republican Members of the Committee on Public Works have insisted that any increase in funds authorized for Federal grants must be used to accelerate needed construction by offering an inducement to the States to participate in the cost of treatment plants. The Water Pollution Control Act of 1966 that was supported by the Republican Members and enacted into law accepts this principle. It contains substantial inducements to the States to participate in the cost of projects under both the accelerated existing program and the proposed clean rivers program.

Through the adoption of a Republican amendment, this law also provides the foundation for future industrial pollution abatement. Under this measure, the Secretary of Interior is directed to conduct an appropriate study of methods for providing incentives to assist in the construction of facilities and works by industry. Tax incentives, as well as other methods of financial assistance, are provided. Seventy-percent Federal grants for research and demonstration projects for prevention of pollution of waters by industry are made available also.

Water pollution poses a serious problem that must be solved. The legislation sponsored and supported by the Republican Members of the House of Representatives will do a great deal to assist in finding a solution. Moreover, the States, cities and the communities will be encouraged to do their share in combating the common problem of water pollution. (See September 14, 1966 Policy Committee statement.)

Combating Federal Controls

When the Defense Production Act was brought to the House floor for extension, the Democratic Members of the Banking and Currency Committee included in the legislation a provision that would give the President standby authority to impose consumer credit controls. Although faced with a serious inflationary situation, the 89th Congress under its Democrat leadership was either unwilling or unable to control the real cause of the inflationary problem — the Great Society spending. Instead, they sought to impose governmental controls as a means of stemming the inflationary tide.

(more)
The Republican Membership in the House of Representatives rejected and opposed this radical and unnecessary proposal. They recognized that in a period of rising inflation, it is the individual with a limited or fixed income that suffers the greatest hardship. Without question, the real casualty of such controls would be the family with substantial needs but moderate means. These individuals do not have the resources to pay cash or make a large downpayment when they purchase an automobile, a refrigerator, or some other household appliance.

Fortunately, a sufficient number of Democrat Members joined the Republicans and the standby authority to impose consumer credit controls was stricken from the legislation. In this instance, the control philosophy was voted down. Thus, extreme and unwarranted powers were kept from the hands of the very individuals whose spending policies have caused the inflationary problem. (See June 14, 1966 Policy Committee statement.)

Fighting Waste, Bungling, and Scandal in the Poverty Program

During the past year, efforts by the Republican Members of the Education and Labor Committee to gather information which would be helpful in drafting effective anti-poverty legislation were hampered and handicapped at every turn. The Democrat majority on the Committee repeatedly promised a full-fledged study and was given $200,000 for this purpose. However, field hearings did not materialize and an ever-changing investigative staff was confused by changes in direction, cancelled trips, and recalls from investigations. The reports which were issued were sketchy and contained statistics and percentages rather than material needed to draft corrective legislation. Moreover, some reports were intentionally withheld from the Republican Members.

The hearings that were finally held on the anti-poverty legislation developed into an 8-day parade of Administration spokesmen and apologists for the poverty program. The Republican Members of the Education and Labor Committee recommended 62 witnesses who were knowledgeable in all aspects of the anti-poverty program. However, these recommendations were ignored and the hearings were abruptly terminated. When Chairman Powell of the Education and Labor Committee was asked why this had been done, his only reply was "because I am the Chairman."

In spite of this arbitrary and woefully inadequate action, there was no real attempt made by the Democrat leadership to correct the many abuses and gross mistakes that plagued the present program and $1.75 billion for fiscal year 1967 was ultimately authorized.

Fortunately for the American public, the Republican Members of the Education and Labor Committee conducted an independent investigation of the poverty program. Abuse after abuse was documented and exposed. A solid basis for an overall reform of the anti-poverty program was established. In order to effectuate the essential reforms and changes, the Republicans introduced substitute legislation entitled the Republican Opportunity Crusade. Unfortunately, this bill and the reforms that it would impose, was rejected. However, a good start on an eventual clean-up of this scandal-ridden program has been made. Republicans will continue to press for needed controls and reforms in the next Congress. (See July 19, 1966 Policy Committee statement.)
Improving Public Transportation

In supporting the establishment of a new Department of Transportation, the Republican Members of the House of Representatives continued the historic policy of the Republican Party of encouraging the development of American transportation. The need for better coordination among the various governmental agencies that deal with transportation has been apparent for many years. In his final budget message to Congress, President Eisenhower stated "A Department of Transportation should be established so as to bring together at Cabinet level the presently fragmented federal functions regarding transportation activities."

The Republican Members were concerned that in the Administration's rush to create a Department of Transportation certain safeguards and considerations might be overlooked. They found that the bill that was originally proposed by the Johnson-Humphrey Administration would have granted the Secretary of Transportation broad authority that invaded the policy-making authority of Congress. It would have scrambled the now-independent accident investigation functions of the CAB with the regulation and control of the airways. Also, the Maritime Administration would be buried deep within the bureaucracy of the new Department.

Due to Republican efforts, the legislation creating the new Department has corrected these defects in the original Administration bill. As a result, the Department of Transportation, as it has now been established, will be able to perform efficiently and effectively. (See August 10, 1966 Policy Committee statement.)

Attacking Tight Money Problems

Although the big company with a large net profit may have little trouble borrowing money, the individual who wants to buy a car, obtain a college loan, or purchase a home has a terrific problem due to the present inflationary situation. If he is lucky enough to find a lender, he may have to pay an extremely high rate of interest to obtain a loan. Long before the Johnson-Humphrey Administration was willing to even admit that a problem existed, the Republican Members of the House of Representatives recognized that the average person was being hurt in the present tight money market and set out on a course of action that would afford this individual meaningful relief.

They called for an immediate slash in non-defense, non-essential domestic spending - not just in regard to appropriations as the President urged, but also with respect to new Great Society program authorizations that trigger the appropriations process. They sought a reduction in point discounts on FHA and VA home financing through an administrative adjustment of rates to a more realistic level. Republicans opposed the enactment of the Sales Participation Act scheme, noting that a program of this type could only mean additional government competition for the already scarce investment dollar. (The Administration subsequently recognized its error in enacting this proposal and suspended the sale of participations.) Republican Members also called for the removal of FNMA's $15,000 administrative limitation on purchases of mortgages under its secondary market operations. This, too, has been implemented by the Administration. Finally, in order to cool off competition for savings among the financial institutions, Republicans pressed for and obtained sound remedial legislation. (more)
It is unfortunate the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has been slow to awaken to the dangers of this situation. Interest rates are now at the highest point that they have been in over 40 years. These high interest rates have added tremendously to the cost of financing the ever-mounting Federal debt. The rising demand for credit by the Federal Government and business has drawn credit away from credit-sensitive industries such as homebuilding. As a result, homebuilding and home buying, one of the Nation's largest industries, is now faced with a major crisis. Private housing starts in September were down 26 percent from September 1965. Applications for FHA-insured mortgages on existing homes were down 34 percent from a year ago.

In the next Congress, Republicans will continue to press for appropriate remedial action. They will do all they can to help the pensioner, the Social Security recipient, and the individual with a fixed income or a fixed wage who has become the forgotten man of the Great Society. (See May 10, June 8, and July 27, 1966 Policy Committee statements.)

* * * * *

Maintaining Law and Order

Republicans of the 89th Congress have stood vigilant in protecting the public's interest in, and demand for, measures assuring increased protection for law and order in our society.

Of primary significance was the National Criminal Law Revision Commission bill introduced by Representative Poff (R.-Va.) and twenty of his Republican colleagues in June of this year. This bill was drafted and introduced when the President's so-called "crime package" of legislation was found to be wanting. The Poff bill was substituted for an unimaginative proposal in the President's package, received bipartisan acclaim and support, and was passed by the House by a unanimous vote on September 6, 1966.

Republicans again answered the growing demand for increased responsibility in the streets and urban centers of our land when Representative Cramer (R.-Fla.) proposed and won approval for an anti-riot measure. This measure prohibited the interstate travel of professional demonstrators and troublemakers. It ultimately prevailed over a watered-down Administration substitute but failed in the Senate. Subsequently, approximately eighty Members of the House, Republican and Democrat, introduced this anti-riot measure as separate legislation. Unfortunately, this legislation was bottled up in the Democrat-controlled Judiciary Committee and failed of passage before the end of the session.

In another and vital area of criminal law reform, the Narcotics Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966, House Republicans again remained vigilant to the cause of law and order. Republican-backed amendments were successful in turning back an Administration attempt to weaken the penalty structure of present law as it applies to sellers of narcotic drugs. Mandatory minimum sentences, which nearly all witnesses at the hearings had agreed upon as an effective deterrent to narcotics traffic, were thereby maintained to assist law-enforcement officers in the war on narcotic traffickers.
STATEMENT BY REP. GERALD R. FORD, R-MICHIGAN, REGARDING 2ND SESSION, 89TH CONGRESS.

The 89th Congress had some successes in its second session, but it will be most remembered for one glaring failure.

That failure was the refusal of this Democratic Congress, this Congress with greater than 2-to-1 Democratic majorities, to come to grips with inflation and thus strike a blow for the little people and the aged.

The destructiveness of the inflation now plaguing this country is worsening. The cost of living is continuing its sharp and steady climb. Yet this Democratic Congress refused to help hold down prices by cutting several billions in unnecessary federal spending. This Democratic Congress instead insisted on further inflating President Johnson's already-inflated budget.

The Nation has just suffered through a nearly-10-month legislative session with the "spendingest" President and Congress in our country's history. Together this combination spells Johnson-Democrat inflation, and that is the story of the second session, 89th Congress.

This Democratic Congress recorded another failure closely related to Johnson-Democrat inflation. The Congress did not increase Social Security benefits this year. Johnson-Democrat inflation demanded that there be action. Republicans urged passage of Social Security legislation at this session and introduced bills providing for automatic increases in benefits tied to the cost of living without a payroll tax increase.

President Johnson and Democrats in Congress ignored Republican pleas. Then Mr. Johnson suddenly--near the end of the session--called for congressional action next year on a benefits increase effective not now but in January, 1968. It was an increase to be financed by a payroll tax boost. When Republicans then demanded an immediate 8% across-the-board increase in Social Security benefits without a payroll tax increase, Democratic leaders shrugged it off.

Please note the answer Republicans received when Rep. John W. Byrnes, R-Wis., proposed a $1.6 billion benefits boost without a payroll tax increase. HEW Undersecretary Wilbur J. Cohen said this could be done but it might contribute substantially to present inflationary pressures. The circle came right back to Johnson-Democrat inflation--the inflation which had created the need for a Social Security benefits increase in the first place. (MORE)
Repeatedly during this session of Congress, President Johnson himself has hung a spender tag on his lopsided Democratic majorities. Yet in a recent campaign speech, Mr. Johnson said the historians would rate the 89th as "the great Congress." The President really ought to make up his mind. He can't have it both ways.

At the end of the last session, Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield said the 89th Congress in its second session ought to "spend less time on new legislation and more time correcting oversights in legislation we have just passed."

Instead the Congress busied itself this year rushing through a whole new batch of legislation proposed by Mr. Johnson. Whatever loophole plugging and remedial action was taken resulted primarily because of Republican pressure.

You might call the tiny band of Republican Congressmen in the 89th the mighty minority because they:

* Helped write into the foreign aid bill a strict prohibition against aid to any free world nation trading with North Vietnam or Cuba.

* Helped hold the mass transit authorization to the $150 million figure asked by the President, reducing it from the $175 million sought by House Democratic leaders.

* Gained a change in the investment tax credit suspension bill to let business firms take the 7 per cent credit for investments in air and water pollution control.

* Exerted pressure which resulted in a $7,500 ceiling on expenses for training a Job Corps enrollee.

* Won approval of Poverty War amendment requiring one-third participation by the poor in local community action programs.

* Led a successful fight to include in the Food for Freedom Act a ban on subsidized food sales to countries trading with North Vietnam.

* Succeeded in keeping the Federal Maritime Administration out of the new Transportation Department so that there can be a concerted effort in the years ahead to rebuild the U.S. merchant fleet.

* Kept constant pressure on big-spending Democrats and thus kept their spending fever from getting worse than it was.

These were among the accomplishments of the 89th Congress, second session—improvements promoted by the mighty minority.

# # #
STATEMENT BY REP. GERALD R. FORD, R-MICHIGAN, REGARDING 2ND SESSION, 89TH CONGRESS.

The 89th Congress had some successes in its second session, but it will be most remembered for one glaring failure.

That failure was the refusal of this Democratic Congress, this Congress with greater than 2-to-1 Democratic majorities, to come to grips with inflation and thus strike a blow for the little people and the aged.

The destructiveness of the inflation now plaguing this country is worsening. The cost of living is continuing its sharp and steady climb. Yet this Democratic Congress refused to help hold down prices by cutting several billions in unnecessary federal spending. This Democratic Congress instead insisted on further inflating President Johnson's already-inflated budget.

The Nation has just suffered through a nearly-10-month legislative session with the "spendingest" President and Congress in our country's history. Together this combination spells Johnson-Democrat inflation, and that is the story of the second session, 89th Congress.

This Democratic Congress recorded another failure closely related to Johnson-Democrat inflation. The Congress did not increase Social Security benefits this year. Johnson-Democrat inflation demanded that there be action. Republicans urged passage of Social Security legislation at this session and introduced bills providing for automatic increases in benefits tied to the cost of living without a payroll tax increase.

President Johnson and Democrats in Congress ignored Republican pleas. Then Mr. Johnson suddenly--near the end of the session--called for congressional action next year on a benefits increase effective not now but in January, 1968. It was an increase to be financed by a payroll tax boost. When Republicans then demanded an immediate 8% across-the-board increase in Social Security benefits without a payroll tax increase, Democratic leaders shrugged it off.

Please note the answer Republicans received when Rep. John W. Byrnes, R-Wis., proposed a $1.6 billion benefits boost without a payroll tax increase. HEW Undersecretary Wilbur J. Cohen said this could be done but it might contribute substantially to present inflationary pressures. The circle came right back to Johnson-Democrat inflation—the inflation which had created the need for a Social Security benefits increase in the first place.
Repeatedly during this session of Congress, President Johnson himself has hung a spender tag on his lopsided Democratic majorities. Yet in a recent campaign speech, Mr. Johnson said the historians would rate the 89th as "the great Congress." The President really ought to make up his mind. He can't have it both ways.

At the end of the last session, Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield said the 89th Congress in its second session ought to "spend less time on new legislation and more time correcting oversights in legislation we have just passed."

Instead the Congress busied itself this year rushing through a whole new batch of legislation proposed by Mr. Johnson. Whatever loophole plugging and remedial action was taken resulted primarily because of Republican pressure.

You might call the tiny band of Republican Congressmen in the 89th the mighty minority because they:

* Helped write into the foreign aid bill a strict prohibition against aid to any free world nation trading with North Vietnam or Cuba.
* Helped hold the mass transit authorization to the $150 million figure asked by the President, reducing it from the $175 million sought by House Democratic leaders.
* Gained a change in the investment tax credit suspension bill to let business firms take the 7 per cent credit for investments in air and water pollution control.
* Exerted pressure which resulted in a $7,500 ceiling on expenses for training a Job Corps enrollee.
* Won approval of Poverty War amendment requiring one-third participation by the poor in local community action programs.
* Led a successful fight to include in the Food for Freedom Act a ban on subsidized food sales to countries trading with North Vietnam.
* Succeeded in keeping the Federal Maritime Administration out of the new Transportation Department so that there can be a concerted effort in the years ahead to rebuild the U.S. merchant fleet.
* Kept constant pressure on big-spending Democrats and thus kept their spending fever from getting worse than it was.

These were among the accomplishments of the 89th Congress, second session--improvements promoted by the mighty minority.

# # #
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

October 25, 1966

For the purposes of supporting programs under title III of the Family Planning Act of 1965, our present plan contemplates $50 million in fiscal year 1967 and $135 million in fiscal year 1968. The definition of "family planning programs" includes "the dissemination of family planning information, medical assistance, and supplies to individuals who desire such assistance." During the consideration of the bill, the Congress confirmed that AIID already possesses authority to use dollar funds, as well as local currencies, for technical assistance and other activities in the field of population control.

The percentage of these bills provide a strong statutory basis for the expansion of the presently expected family planning programs at home and abroad. There can be no greater evil in the administration of the country than the bill was determined to diffuse the population bomb.

The population explosion takes every hour of every day. There is no moment to lose in dealing with, what President Johnson has called the most profound challenge to the future of all the world. It now remains for the administration to provide the initiative, the energy, and the staff to implement these programs effectively.

Under Secretary

October 25, 1966

Statement by Representative Gerald R. Ford, Republican, of Michigan, Regarding 2d Session, 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the 88th Congress had some success in its 2d session, but it will be most remembered for one glaring failure.

That failure was the refusal of this Democratic Congress, this Congress with greater than 2-to-1 Democratic majorities, to come to grips with inflation and thus strike a blow for the people and the aged.

The distressiveness of the inflation now plaguing this country is worsening. The cost of living is continuing its sharp and steady climb. Yet this Democratic Congress refused to help hold down prices by cutting several billions in unnecessary Federal spending. This Democratic Congress instead insisted on further inflationary programs, making it impossible for President Johnson's already-inflated budget.

The Nation has just suffered through a nearly 18-month legislative session with the "sagacious" President and Congress in our country's history. Together this combinationsplice Johnson-Democratic inflation, and that is the story of the 2d session, 89th Congress.

This Democratic Congress recorded another failure closely related to Johnson-Democratic inflation. The Congress did not increase social security benefits this year Johnson-Democratic inflation demanded that there be action. Republicans urged passage of social security legislation at this session and introduced bills providing for substantial increases in benefits tied to the cost of living without a payroll tax increase.

President Johnson and Democrats in Congress ignored Republican pleas. Then Mr. Johnson suddenly—near the end of the session—called for congressional action next year on a benefits increase effective not now but in January 1968. It was an increase to be financed by a payroll tax boost. When Republi-
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, October 22, 1966
Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I understand unanimously consent to insert in the Record a summary of activities by the Senate Committee on Armed Services.
There being no objection, the summary of activities so ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Summary of Activities by the Senate Committee on Armed Services

-CONGRESSIONAL RECORD- APPENDIX

P.L. 80-587 Supplemental 1966 authorization for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, for research, development, test and evaluation, and for military construction.

Authorization appropriations for these purposes in the amount of $4,827,460 and additional for the procurement during fiscal year 1967 of submarines, naval ships, combat vessels, and for research development, test, and evaluation for the stated forms and military pay increases.

Authorization appropriations for these purposes in the amount of $17,660,199.

Provisions a pay increase for members of the armed forces.

P.L. 80-588 Military construction authorizations.

Authorization military construction and providing for housing construction and maintenance in the amount of $54,500,000.

P.L. 80-584 Military medical benefits.

Authorization improved health benefits and medical care for members of the armed forces and their dependents and for retired members by increasing a program of civilian care from civilian medical sources for dependents of members and by providing a program of care in civilian facilities for members of the uniformed services.

Authorization increasing number of Air Force nurses and assigning nurses to be as military personnel authorized for Air Force officers in the grade of colonel and subsequently elected by extreming an increase in the number of officers that may hold these grades.

P.L. 80-562 Candidature for appointment in the military academies.

Permits the son of Reserve officers who have served in the Reserves for three years to take the examinations necessary for appointment to the military academies.

P.L. 80-563 General and special emergency circumstances.

Permits the President to proclaim a general or special emergency circumstances, as provided for in the act of April 20, 1944, in which an act of emergency is carried out.

P.L. 80-589 Civil defense emergency authorities.

Extends the authority of the President to proclaim a civil defense emergency in such an event.

P.L. 80-590 Naval auxiliary service.

Increases the number of Naval reserve forces that can be general officers.

P.L. 80-591 Salary of academic dean of Naval Academy.

Increases the salary of the academic dean of the Naval Academy.

P.L. 80-592 Civilian compensation.

Introduces a limitation on the salary of the academic dean of the Naval Academy.

P.L. 80-593 Loan of navy vessels to the government of China.

Authorizes the loan of one destroyer and one destructor for the use of China.

P.L. 80-594 Donation of certain weapons to Germany.

Authorization 30 days loan and round trip transportation in the United States to the government of China.

P.L. 80-595 Authorization to pay direct assistance to certain nations.

Authorization to pay assistance to certain nations.

P.L. 80-596 Military assistance.

Authorization military assistance to certain nations.

P.L. 80-598 Military assistance.

Authorization military assistance to certain nations.

P.L. 80-599 Loan of equipment to Japan.

Authorization loan of equipment to Japan.

P.L. 80-600 Loan of equipment to South Korea.

Authorization loan of equipment to South Korea.
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

STATEMENT BY HOUSE MINORITY LEADER GERALD R. FORD, R-MICH., RE 1966 ELECTIONS

The voters Tuesday took a sizable step forward--toward Responsible Government. The Republican gains registered throughout the country were a victory not only for the Republican Party but for the American people.

The election results are particularly meaningful for the House of Representatives. The forces of moderation will be measurably strengthened in the next Congress. Republicans will have greater representation on congressional committees and will be able to take a hand in writing the nation's laws. This means Republicans can concentrate on building a record in the 90th Congress and on pointing the nation's course toward more responsible government. This promises a healthy choice for the voters in 1968.

Perhaps the most salutary effect of the 1966 elections is that there may be more prudent and frugal use of the taxpayers' money by the 90th Congress because of the increase in Republican numbers. This could serve as a brake on inflation and help to steady the economy.

The voters made some wise choices on Tuesday. I only hope the good-government process begun in the 1966 elections is completed in 1968.
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