

**The original documents are located in Box D21, folder “Grocery Manufacturers of America, New York, NY, November 14, 1966” of the Ford Congressional Papers: Press Secretary and Speech File at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.**

### **Copyright Notice**

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 The Council donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections.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

*Gov. J. V. ... Island*  
REMARKS BEFORE GROCERY MANUFACTURERS OF AMERICA, N.Y., N.Y.

*Write any <sup>down</sup> place & please*  
MONDAY, NOV. 14, 1966

*Mr. Rogers*  
ONE OF THE PHENOMENA OF 1966, A YEAR MARKED BY TURMOIL AND VIOLENCE IN AMERICA, WAS THE HOUSEWIVES' REBELLION.

WE ARE NOT TALKING, OF COURSE, ABOUT ANY MOVEMENT BY THE MARRIED WOMEN OF THIS COUNTRY TO QUIT WIELDING DUST MOPS OR GETTING HUBBY'S DINNER. WE ARE REFERRING TO THAT WIDESPREAD BOYCOTT OF THE SUPERMARKETS, SOMETIMES KNOWN AS THE PETTICOAT PROTEST.

THIS REVOLT COULD HAVE BEEN ANTICIPATED IN A YEAR WHEN PRICES SKYROCKETED AND THE JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION DID LITTLE TO FIGHT INFLATION *the basic cause* BUT BLAME SOMEBODY ELSE.

NOW MANY AMERICANS ARE WONDERING IF AND WHERE THE PRICE RISES WILL STOP. WILL THERE BE WAGE AND PRICE



CONTROLS? WILL THERE BE RATIONING?

ON THE QUESTION OF RATIONING I THINK THE ANSWER IS  
OBVIOUS. UNLESS WE ARE PLUNGED INTO FULLSCALE WAR THAT  
CREATES SHORTAGES AT HOME, WE WILL NOT HAVE RATIONING.  
WHAT IS IN SHORT SUPPLY? CERTAINLY NOT GROCERIES. THE  
INFLATIONARY SPIRAL WE ARE EXPERIENCING TODAY IS NOT DUE  
TO SHORTAGES. THE BASIS FOR IT IS AN OVER-ABUNDANCE OF  
CHEAP MONEY IN THE ECONOMY--AND ONLY THE GOVERNMENT CAN  
CORRECT THAT *by coordinated & responsible fiscal & monetary policies.*

*Certainly, most unlikely but*

WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS? ~~THIS~~ IS NOT ALTOGETHER OUT  
OF THE QUESTION, ~~ALTHOUGH~~ I CERTAINLY DON'T SEE IT AS JUST  
AROUND THE CORNER.

*as something  
this Congress will have on its  
agenda.*

THE OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING DOES HAVE A STANDBY  
PROGRAM OF WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS CRANKED UP READY TO GO



*Bryant*  
IF IT IS NEEDED. THEY WOULDN'T BE DOING THEIR JOB IF THEY  
DIDN'T HAVE SUCH A CONTINGENCY PROGRAM ON PAPER. ~~BUT~~ I  
DON'T THINK IT WILL BE NEEDED, AND I AM CERTAIN NEARLY ALL  
MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESS VIEW IT AS A LAST-RESORT MEASURE.  
ONE THING TO KEEP IN MIND IS THAT WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS  
DO REQUIRE APPROVAL BY THE CONGRESS.

SPEAKING FOR HOUSE REPUBLICANS, I'M SURE YOU CAN  
EXPECT THAT WE WILL FIRST SEEK DEEP AND MEANINGFUL CUTS  
IN UNNECESSARY FEDERAL SPENDING AS A WEAPON AGAINST  
INFLATION. IF SPENDING IS NOT CUT SUBSTANTIALY, THEN I  
BELIEVE THE ADMINISTRATION WILL ASK FOR AN ACROSS-THE-BOARD  
INCREASE IN PERSONAL AND CORPORATE INCOME TAXES. WAGE AND  
PRICE CONTROLS WOULD BE A DESPERATION MEASURE THROWN INTO  
THE BREACH ONLY IF OTHER LESS DRASTIC MEASURES FAIL TO



*Jan 1967*  
-4-

HALT INFLATION. CONTROLS, WOULD ATTACK THE SYMPTOMS AND  
NOT THE CAUSE OF INFLATION.

THE ACTIONS OF LABOR WILL HAVE GREAT IMPORT FOR THE  
HEALTH OF THE ECONOMY IN 1967 AS CONTRACTS COVERING  
MILLIONS OF WORKERS COME UP FOR RENEWAL.

WE CAN ALSO EXPECT THAT PRESIDENT JOHNSON WILL TRY  
AGAIN TO REDEEM HIS PROMISE TO ORGANIZED LABOR TO ~~WIN~~ *multiply*  
REPEAL OF STATE RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS. AS YOU KNOW, STATES  
NOW ARE PERMITTED BY SECTION 14B OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT  
TO PASS RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS. YOU ALSO KNOW THAT MR. JOHNSON  
SOUGHT REPEAL OF SECTION 14B IN THE LAST CONGRESS. A BILL  
TO REPEAL 14B NARROWLY PASSED THE HOUSE BUT DIED IN THE  
SENATE.





WITH THE DEFEAT OF MANY NORTHERN DEMOCRATS IN THE  
1966 ELECTIONS, THERE IS <sup>for</sup> LESS CHANCE FOR REPEAL OF 14B IN  
THE 90TH CONGRESS THAN THERE WAS IN THE 89TH. IN FACT,  
I WOULD GUESS THAT <sup>any proposal repeal?</sup> 14B COULD NOT ~~EVEN~~ GET THROUGH THE HOUSE  
IN THE NEW CONGRESS.

IN THE 89TH CONGRESS, THE ADMINISTRATION PROPOSAL OF  
A FOUR-YEAR TERM FOR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE DIED ALONG WITH  
14B REPEAL. IN FACT, A BILL TO AUTHORIZE A FOUR-YEAR TERM  
<sup>failed to</sup> DIDN'T EVEN WIN APPROVAL OF THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE.  
I WAS OPPOSED TO IT, ALONG WITH MANY OTHER MEMBERS OF THE  
HOUSE.

IN ANALYZING WHAT'S WRONG WITH A FOUR-YEAR TERM FOR  
HOUSE MEMBERS, LET'S LOOK AT WHAT'S RIGHT WITH THE PRESENT  
SYSTEM.



*Campaign*

OUR IMMEDIATE PAST POLITICAL HISTORY IS THE BEST  
EXAMPLE OF WHY WE SHOULD PRESERVE TWO-YEAR TERMS FOR CONGRESS  
MEN.

THE 1966 ELECTION-[IN WHICH ALL 435 HOUSE MEMBERS BUT  
ONLY 35 MEMBERS OF THE SENATE STOOD BEFORE THE ELECTORATE-  
WAS THE ONLY CHANCE THE VOTERS HAD TO EXPRESS THEIR  
FEELINGS ABOUT THE JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION IN MID-TERM OF  
THE PRESIDENCY.

IF HOUSE MEMBERS WERE ELECTED TO FOUR-YEAR TERMS ALONG  
WITH THE PRESIDENT, THERE WOULD BE NO OPPORTUNITY FOR A  
MID-TERM PROTEST. VOTERS WOULD HAVE TO NURSE THEIR  
FRUSTRATIONS AND IRRITATIONS FOR ANOTHER TWO YEARS. THE  
POLICIES OF THE GOVERNMENT WOULD NOT BE SUBJECT TO NOTICEABLE  
CHANGE.

THE BLESSING OF A TWO-YEAR TERM FOR CONGRESSMEN IS THAT IT CONSTITUTES A SAFETY VALVE FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE-- A CHANCE TO BLOW OFF STEAM IN THE MIDDLE OF A PRESIDENT'S TERM.

IT ALSO GIVES THE PEOPLE AN OPPORTUNITY TO LET THE ADMINISTRATION KNOW THEY WANT A CHANGE IN POLICY, NEW DIRECTIONS, A SLOWDOWN OR MORE FORWARD THRUST, A SHIFT TO THE RIGHT, THE LEFT OR THE MIDDLE. I ~~PERSONALLY~~ FEEL THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE BASICALLY MIDDLE-OF-THE-ROAD, AND THE OFF-YEAR CONGRESSIONAL ELECTIONS SERVE AS A REMINDER OF THAT FACT. THAT IS JUST WHAT HAPPENED LAST NOV. 8 WHEN MY PARTY SCORED SIGNIFICANT GAINS IN VARIOUS PARTS OF THE COUNTRY.

[ WILL FOUR-YEAR TERMS FOR CONGRESSMEN BE AUTHORIZED BY





THE 90TH CONGRESS? NOT IF I CAN HELP IT--AND I WOULD GUESS  
THERE WILL BE LESS PUSH BEHIND THE FOUR-YEAR TERM PROPOSAL  
IN THE 90TH CONGRESS THAN THERE WAS IN THE 89TH. THE  
REASON IS THAT WE CAME DANGEROUSLY CLOSE TO ONE-MAN  
GOVERNMENT IN THE 89TH CONGRESS WHEN THE DEMOCRATS ENJOYED  
THE MOUNTAINOUS MAJORITIES OF MORE THAN 2 TO 1.

*the last 2 years have been whittled down - the will be more competitive in the legislative process*  
THE LEGISLATIVE RUBBER-STAMPING WE WITNESSED IN THE  
89TH CONGRESS WOULD HAVE CONTINUED FOR ANOTHER TWO YEARS  
IF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE HAD NOT HAD THE CHANCE TO CHANGE  
THE COMPLEXION OF THE CONGRESS.

THE NATION IS FORTUNATE, INDEED, THAT MEMBERS OF THE  
HOUSE ARE KEPT CLOSE TO THE PEOPLE.

-----THANK YOU-----

---END---



REMARKS BY REP. GERALD R. FORD BEFORE GROCERY MANUFACTURERS OF AMERICA, N. Y., N. Y.

One of the phenomena of 1966, a year marked by turmoil and violence in America, was the housewives' rebellion.

We are not talking, of course, about any movement by the married women of this country to quit wielding dust mops or getting hubby's dinner. We are referring to that widespread boycott of the supermarkets sometimes known as the petticoat protest.

This revolt could have been anticipated in a year when prices skyrocketed and the Johnson Administration did little to fight inflation but blame somebody else.

Now many Americans are wondering if and where the price rises will stop. Will there be wage and price controls? Will there be rationing?

On the question of rationing I think the answer is obvious. Unless we are plunged into fullscale war that creates shortages at home, we will not have rationing. What is in short supply? Certainly not groceries. The inflationary spiral we are experiencing today is not due to shortages. The basis for it is an over-abundance of cheap money in the economy--and only the government can correct that.

Wage and price controls? This is not altogether out of the question, although I certainly don't see it as just around the corner.

The Office of Emergency Planning does have a standby program of wage and price controls cranked up ready to go if it is needed. They wouldn't be doing their job if they didn't have such a contingency program on paper. But I don't think it will be needed, and I am certain nearly all members of the Congress view it as a last-resort measure. One thing to keep in mind is that wage and price controls do require approval by the Congress.

Speaking for House Republicans, I'm sure you can expect that we will first seek deep and meaningful cuts in unnecessary federal spending as a weapon against inflation. If spending is not cut substantially, then I believe the Administration will ask for an across-the-board increase in personal and corporate income taxes. Wage and price controls would be a desperation measure thrown into the breach only if other less drastic measures fail to halt inflation. Controls would attack the symptoms and not the cause of inflation.

The actions of labor will have great import for the health of the economy in 1967 as contracts covering millions of workers come up for renewal.

We can also expect that President Johnson will try again to redeem his promise to organized labor to win repeal of state right-to-work laws. As you know, states now are permitted by Section 14b of the Taft-Hartley Act to pass right-to-work laws. You also know that Mr. Johnson sought repeal of Section 14b in the last Congress. A bill to repeal 14b narrowly passed the House but died in the Senate.

(More)



With the defeat of many northern Democrats in the 1966 elections, there is less chance for repeal of 14b in the 90th Congress than there was in the 89th. In fact, I would guess that 14b could not even get through the House in the new Congress.

In the 89th Congress, the Administration proposal of a four-year term for members of the House died along with 14b repeal. In fact, a bill to authorize a four-year term didn't even win approval of the House Judiciary Committee. I was opposed to it, along with many other members of the House.

In analyzing what's wrong with a four-year term for House members, let's look at what's right with the present system.

Our immediate past political history is the best example of why we should preserve two-year terms for congressmen.

The 1966 election--in which all 435 House members but only 35 members of the Senate stood before the electorate--was the only chance the voters had to express their feelings about the Johnson Administration in mid-term of the Presidency.

If House members were elected to four-year terms along with the President, there would be no opportunity for a mid-term protest. Voters would have to nurse their frustrations and irritations for another two years. The policies of the government would not be subject to noticeable change.

The blessing of a two-year term for congressmen is that it constitutes a safety valve for the American people--a chance to blow off steam in the middle of a President's term.

It also gives the people an opportunity to let the Administration know they want a change in policy, new directions, a slowdown or more forward thrust, a shift to the right, the left or the middle. I personally feel the American people are basically middle-of-the-road, and the off-year congressional elections serve as a reminder of that fact. That is just what happened last Nov. 8 when my party scored significant gains in various parts of the country.

Will four-year terms for congressmen be authorized by the 90th Congress? Not if I can help it--and I would guess there will be less push behind the four-year term proposal in the 90th Congress than there was in the 89th. The reason is that we came dangerously close to one-man government in the 89th Congress when the Democrats enjoyed mountainous majorities of more than 2 to 1.

The legislative rubber-stamping we witnessed in the 89th Congress would have continued for another two years if the American people had not had the chance to change the complexion of the Congress.

The nation is fortunate, indeed, that members of the House are kept close to the people. Thank you.

REMARKS BY REP. GERALD R. FORD BEFORE GROCERY MANUFACTURERS OF AMERICA, N. Y., N. Y.

One of the phenomena of 1966, a year marked by turmoil and violence in America, was the housewives' rebellion.

We are not talking, of course, about any movement by the married women of this country to quit wielding dust mops or getting hubby's dinner. We are referring to that widespread boycott of the supermarkets sometimes known as the petticoat protest.

This revolt could have been anticipated in a year when prices skyrocketed and the Johnson Administration did little to fight inflation but blame somebody else.

Now many Americans are wondering if and where the price rises will stop. Will there be wage and price controls? Will there be rationing?

On the question of rationing I think the answer is obvious. Unless we are plunged into fullscale war that creates shortages at home, we will not have rationing. What is in short supply? Certainly not groceries. The inflationary spiral we are experiencing today is not due to shortages. The basis for it is an over-abundance of cheap money in the economy--and only the government can correct that.

Wage and price controls? This is not altogether out of the question, although I certainly don't see it as just around the corner.

The Office of Emergency Planning does have a standby program of wage and price controls cranked up ready to go if it is needed. They wouldn't be doing their job if they didn't have such a contingency program on paper. But I don't think it will be needed, and I am certain nearly all members of the Congress view it as a last-resort measure. One thing to keep in mind is that wage and price controls do require approval by the Congress.

Speaking for House Republicans, I'm sure you can expect that we will first seek deep and meaningful cuts in unnecessary federal spending as a weapon against inflation. If spending is not cut substantially, then I believe the Administration will ask for an across-the-board increase in personal and corporate income taxes. Wage and price controls would be a desperation measure thrown into the breach only if other less drastic measures fail to halt inflation. Controls would attack the symptoms and not the cause of inflation.

The actions of labor will have great import for the health of the economy in 1967 as contracts covering millions of workers come up for renewal.

We can also expect that President Johnson will try again to redeem his promise to organized labor to win repeal of state right-to-work laws. As you know, states now are permitted by Section 14b of the Taft-Hartley Act to pass right-to-work laws. You also know that Mr. Johnson sought repeal of Section 14b in the last Congress. A bill to repeal 14b narrowly passed the House but died in the Senate.

(More)

With the defeat of many northern Democrats in the 1966 elections, there is less chance for repeal of 14b in the 90th Congress than there was in the 89th. In fact, I would guess that 14b could not even get through the House in the new Congress.

In the 89th Congress, the Administration proposal of a four-year term for members of the House died along with 14b repeal. In fact, a bill to authorize a four-year term didn't even win approval of the House Judiciary Committee. I was opposed to it, along with many other members of the House.

In analyzing what's wrong with a four-year term for House members, let's look at what's right with the present system.

Our immediate past political history is the best example of why we should preserve two-year terms for congressmen.

The 1966 election--in which all 435 House members but only 35 members of the Senate stood before the electorate--was the only chance the voters had to express their feelings about the Johnson Administration in mid-term of the Presidency.

If House members were elected to four-year terms along with the President, there would be no opportunity for a mid-term protest. Voters would have to nurse their frustrations and irritations for another two years. The policies of the government would not be subject to noticeable change.

The blessing of a two-year term for congressmen is that it constitutes a safety valve for the American people--a chance to blow off steam in the middle of a President's term.

It also gives the people an opportunity to let the Administration know they want a change in policy, new directions, a slowdown or more forward thrust, a shift to the right, the left or the middle. I personally feel the American people are basically middle-of-the-road, and the off-year congressional elections serve as a reminder of that fact. That is just what happened last Nov. 8 when my party scored significant gains in various parts of the country.

Will four-year terms for congressmen be authorized by the 90th Congress? Not if I can help it--and I would guess there will be less push behind the four-year term proposal in the 90th Congress than there was in the 89th. The reason is that we came dangerously close to one-man government in the 89th Congress when the Democrats enjoyed mountainous majorities of more than 2 to 1.

The legislative rubber-stamping we witnessed in the 89th Congress would have continued for another two years if the American people had not had the chance to change the complexion of the Congress.

The nation is fortunate, indeed, that members of the House are kept close to the people. Thank you.