



CONGRESSMAN  
**GERALD R. FORD**  
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

**NEWS  
RELEASE**

FOR RELEASE AT 7 P.M.  
SATURDAY, OCT. 8, 1966

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH AT GOP DINNER FOR REP. JONAS, R-N.C., AT LINCOLNTON, N. C.

Inflation will be worse next year--not better--and you don't have to look very far to find the reason.

Look at the White House and you see the spendingest President in American history. Look at the 89th Congress and you see wild-spending Democrats who have inflated the President's already-inflated budget.

No amount of Republican warning has been able to cool off these profligate dispensers of the taxpayers' dollars.

That's why the American economy has become overheated. That's why it has stayed over-charged. That's why all Americans are paying the high cost of inflation, the high cost of Johnson, the high cost of a lopsided automatic Democratic Congress.

These Americans who buy the Johnson-Democrat philosophy that the federal government can solve all our problems by spending more and more billions demand a Republican answer to inflation.

The Republican answer is that we didn't have to get this way in the first place. Inflation didn't have to happen and it wouldn't have happened if President Johnson had made one or two politically painful decisions last January.

Another way of putting it is that inflation wouldn't have happened if the Republican Party had been in power.

Let's look back to January, 1966. That's when Republicans told President Johnson and the nation that this country could not fight a costly war halfway around the world without cutting back on non-essential domestic spending. And that's also when Mr. Johnson blithely told Congress and the nation that we could eat cake despite the Vietnam War--and we could have it with frosting, too.

President Johnson failed to apply a combination of fiscal and monetary restraints early this year when they would have been most timely and most effective. He kept right on pumping more federal billions into the economy, with plans to expand spending on Great Society programs by \$3.2 billion in fiscal 1967.

(MORE)

SPEECH EXCERPTS

President Johnson still talks about cutting spending. He's been talking about it for months until he's become like the shepherd boy who kept crying "Wolf" until nobody believed him when the wolf ~~attacked~~ <sup>did come</sup>.

The President most recently pledged a \$3 billion spending reduction, but his wild-spending Democrat friends in Congress are adding anywhere from \$2 to \$8 billion to his budget. So, tell me, where does the country go from there?

What have Republicans done to fight the battle of inflation? House Republicans have sought time after time not only to hold down the hopelessly irresponsible spending plans of their Democratic colleagues but to cut a number of presidential budget requests by 5 per cent. In all of these attempts, nearly 90 per cent of the Democrats have voted against economy.

The same day that House Democrats pushed through an elementary-secondary school aid bill \$328 million fatter than the President had asked for, the President said: "Each vote to increase the budget is likely a vote for increased revenue later."

I say each vote to increase the budget is a vote for inflation. I say that in virtually every instance where Democrats in Congress have adhered to the President's budget levels it has been pressure from the tiny Republican minority which has accomplished it.

The most tragic aspect of the frightening inflation which is sweeping this country is the hurt to our old people. Americans living on Social Security, all those on fixed income, are driven deeper and deeper into a corner of poverty as prices roll inexorably upward.

Republicans would do something about this--now. In addition to pressuring the Democratic powerhouse to do something about inflation, Republicans in the House and Senate have introduced bills to tie Social Security to the cost of living. Whenever the consumer price index goes up at least 3 per cent, Social Security benefits would go up correspondingly.

Consumer prices as measured across-the-board by the Labor Department have climbed 3.5 per cent in just the past 12 months. But the Democrats refuse to do anything about a Social Security cost-of-living provision. Could this be because it is a Republican plan? Would it be embarrassing and damaging to the Democrats politically?

Enactment of the Republican plan for a Social Security cost-of-living clause would remove Social Security benefit increases from the political arena once and for all. I see no reason why we haven't done it unless it is because the Democrats want to keep using Social Security as a political football.





CONGRESSMAN  
**GERALD R. FORD**  
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

**NEWS  
RELEASE**

FOR RELEASE AT 7 P.M.  
SATURDAY, OCT. 8, 1966

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH AT GOP DINNER FOR REP. JONAS, R-N.C., AT LINCOLNTON, N. C.

Inflation will be worse next year--not better--and you don't have to look very far to find the reason.

Look at the White House and you see the spendingest President in American history. Look at the 89th Congress and you see wild-spending Democrats who have inflated the President's already-inflated budget.

No amount of Republican warning has been able to cool off these profligate dispensers of the taxpayers' dollars.

That's why the American economy has become overheated. That's why it has stayed over-charged. That's why all Americans are paying the high cost of inflation, the high cost of Johnson, the high cost of a lopsided automatic Democratic Congress.

These Americans who buy the Johnson-Democrat philosophy that the federal government can solve all our problems by spending more and more billions demand a Republican answer to inflation.

The Republican answer is that we didn't have to get this way in the first place. Inflation didn't have to happen and it wouldn't have happened if President Johnson had made one or two politically painful decisions last January.

Another way of putting it is that inflation wouldn't have happened if the Republican Party had been in power.

Let's look back to January, 1966. That's when Republicans told President Johnson and the nation that this country could not fight a costly war halfway around the world without cutting back on non-essential domestic spending. And that's also when Mr. Johnson blithely told Congress and the nation that we could eat cake despite the Vietnam War--and we could have it with frosting, too.

President Johnson failed to apply a combination of fiscal and monetary restraints early this year when they would have been most timely and most effective. He kept right on pumping more federal billions into the economy, with plans to expand spending on Great Society programs by \$3.2 billion in fiscal 1967.

(MORE)

SPEECH EXCERPTS

President Johnson still talks about cutting spending. He's been talking about it for months until he's become like the shepherd boy who kept crying "Wolf" until nobody believed him when the wolf attacked.

The President most recently pledged a \$3 billion spending reduction, but his wild-spending Democrat friends in Congress are adding anywhere from \$2 to \$8 billion to his budget. So, tell me, where does the country go from there?

What have Republicans done to fight the battle of inflation? House Republicans have sought time after time not only to hold down the hopelessly irresponsible spending plans of their Democratic colleagues but to cut a number of presidential budget requests by 5 per cent. In all of these attempts, nearly 90 per cent of the Democrats have voted against economy.

The same day that House Democrats pushed through an elementary-secondary school aid bill \$328 million fatter than the President had asked for, the President said: "Each vote to increase the budget is likely a vote for increased revenue later."

I say each vote to increase the budget is a vote for inflation. I say that in virtually every instance where Democrats in Congress have adhered to the President's budget levels it has been pressure from the tiny Republican minority which has accomplished it.

The most tragic aspect of the frightening inflation which is sweeping this country is the hurt to our old people. Americans living on Social Security, all those on fixed income, are driven deeper and deeper into a corner of poverty as prices roll inexorably upward.

Republicans would do something about this--now. In addition to pressuring the Democratic powerhouse to do something about inflation, Republicans in the House and Senate have introduced bills to tie Social Security to the cost of living. Whenever the consumer price index goes up at least 3 per cent, Social Security benefits would go up correspondingly.

Consumer prices as measured across-the-board by the Labor Department have climbed 3.5 per cent in just the past 12 months. But the Democrats refuse to do anything about a Social Security cost-of-living provision. Could this be because it is a Republican plan? Would it be embarrassing and damaging to the Democrats politically?

Enactment of the Republican plan for a Social Security cost-of-living clause would remove Social Security benefit increases from the political arena once and for all. I see no reason why we haven't done it unless it is because the Democrats want to keep using Social Security as a political football.