

Remarks of Congressman Bob Dole (R-Kan) Before Republican
Citizens Committee Annual Meeting of Onondaga County, at
Syracuse, New York, in the 34th District of New York, repre-
sented by the Honorable R. Walter Riehlman -- January 27, 1964

First, I thank my friend and colleague for inviting me. I consider it an honor and privilege to be the guest of such an outstanding and respected colleague and, secondly, to be visiting with a group such as yours. While it is certainly not necessary to "plug" your Congressman, I do want to acknowledge the great interest he has created by introduction of a bill last Tuesday calling for establishment of a Commission on organization and operations of the Executive Branch of government modeled after the "Hoover Commissions" established by Congress in 1947 and 1953. It would provide essentially for re-establishment of the Hoover Commissions on a permanent basis, with even more emphasis on the elimination of unnecessary departments, agencies and instrumentalities within the Executive Branch of our government. All Americans share what I hope was a sincere statement by President Johnson when he indicated his determination that "this nation will get a dollar's worth for every dollar spent." Personally, I know of no better way President Johnson could reaffirm his determination than by endorsement of the Riehlman measure. Economy is everybody's business--should be bi-partisan, or better yet, non-partisan. In my brief tenure in Congress, I have seen a lot of economy "preached" but very little "practiced." I know Walter has witnessed the same frustration, only for a considerably longer period of time.

It becomes more and more apparent that the Executive Branch of government, including the almost countless federal agencies, are gaining the upper hand over the Legislative Branch. Each agency literally has scores of experts and public relations representatives to analyze and sell their programs, and the frustration a member of Congress faces when one pack of experts after another comes before his committee is difficult to describe. We cannot possibly, with our limited staffs (I'm not suggesting we have larger ones) check into the intricacies of every program, and no one knows this better than those who seek to expand their bureaucratic empires. A case in point:

January 27, 1964

"There were moans and groans in Congress, in many foreign countries, and some in this country when the foreign aid appropriations bill was slashed to \$3 billion. No doubt about it, the foreign aid program faced the severest Congressional opposition since its beginning, which confirmed 'grass roots' thinking that our country cannot continue nearly unlimited aid to over 100 countries year after year, and also that Americans are weary of talk about streamlining foreign aid programs, cutting out waste, and winning friends.

"Many members of Congress were therefore not surprised after all the bureaucratic moaning and groaning, that David E. Bell, Foreign Aid Chief, and White House economic advisor, Walter W. Heller, 'found' \$669,876,000 unspent and unobligated funds 'they didn't know they had' after Congress appropriated them \$3 billion. Now \$670 million, nearly 3/4 of a billion dollars, is not much in a program which has already cost over \$100 billion, but a good percentage of this has been spent on proven waste, inefficiency, duplication, and in many cases, downright stupidity of parts of the programs, which are too complex to understand and too large to support.

"When Congress finally reduced foreign aid to \$3 billion, I doubt Aid Director Bell was really 'surprised' to find the additional funds. While very few Congressmen advocate complete cessation of foreign aid programs, many feel they are annually partially hoodwinked by bureaucratic Aid officials. Democrat Otto V. Passman of Louisiana, Chairman, House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, which handles the foreign aid bill, indicated, 'Dr. Bell has the habit of writing letters that say one thing and mean another. I find it absolutely impossible to get him to level with me or the Committee.'

"The evasions and half-truths coupled with emotional, if not factual, editorials tend to condition the mind of many that a penny cut from a foreign aid bill would mean a surrender to Communism. It seems strange year after year Congress succumbs to this shallow argument, and it would be better to determine who and where our friends are, and either demand the unvarnished truth from foreign aid officials or replace them on a wholesale basis."

Congressman Riehlman's approach would be a more direct way of assuring complete saving through the elimination of duplication and inefficiency.

It is with envy I note this Congressional district contains but one county, as compared with the 58 counties in the 1st Congressional District of Kansas, and while there perhaps are differences, it would appear the basic interests of the people are similar. Today, Kansas is our Republican state, and I believe in 1964, Republican strength will take a great leap forward everywhere.

I am not come here as an expert but as a "partisan American" completely fed up with the hand-out philosophy. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I have followed closely the efforts of Orville Freeman to control and regiment American farmers, and many of us in Washington are surprised Orville is still around after the resounding defeat of the wheat referendum on May 21 of last year. In unmistakable terms the American wheat pro-

January 27, 1964

ducer flatly rejected, not just a wheat program, but the first step in Freeman's master plan to reduce the American farmer to a mere "hired hand." Following this defeat, Secretary Freeman toured Russia and its satellites, and after an absence of more than 30 days, returned to America, made many pronouncements about the improved Russian farm technology and increased production methods, only to belatedly learn, and I should think with some embarrassment, that at the very time of his visit the Russian farmer was experiencing drastic crop failure. At this point, let me briefly discuss the so-called wheat sale controversy, and since I come from the largest wheat producing district in America, I can discuss this proposal with some objectivity.

The battle over a proposal to prohibit extension of credit or credit guarantees to communist countries in purchasing wheat or other commodities kept Congress in session. Less than two weeks following the first sale of wheat to communist Russia, many who "pushed" the wheat sales objected strenuously to England selling buses to communist Cuba. The amendment was not intended to prohibit sales, but on the basis of Russia's past record it appeared "cash on the barrelhead" was in order, but it was defeated.

Many facts were ignored in the "Yuletide" adjournment rush. I made a statement on the House Floor, December 24, which is summarized as follows:

(1.) Present Russian obligations from W.W. I--with interest, total over \$620 million. (2.) So-called pipeline lend-lease in W.W. II--that is material ordered by Russia and delivered at or after end of war. The amount agreed due was over \$222 million--nearly \$206 million is still unpaid. (3.) The \$11 billion lend-lease shipped to Russia during W.W. II--we agreed to settle for \$800 million--Russia offered \$300 million in full settlement. (4.) Russia now owes nearly \$43 million for unpaid special assessments. (5.) In the same bill containing the "Red credit ban," American taxpayers are asked to "shell out" nearly \$3 billion for foreign aid for what? Why, to protect us from communism. (6.) Guarantee of Russian credit is a new departure for the Export-Import Bank; in fact, since its inception in 1934 the bank has never insured a credit risk or extended credit to any communist country except Yugoslavia, which has been treated "specially." (7.) Defense appro-

priations this year exceeded \$51 billion--all, we are told, to protect us from communism. Some 14,000 Americans are now in Viet Nam fighting communism and 158 (now 187) Americans have made the supreme sacrifice.

WHAT'S AHEAD IN '64?

Yesterday's Washington Sunday Star's lead editorial, "A Budget for 1965 With an Eye to 1964," was a most interesting discussion of the dramatic budget presented by President Johnson. As the Wall Street Journal accurately indicated last week, the budget is filled with "razzle-dazzle" and contains more gimmicks than a Rube Goldberg invention.

Washington, D. C. is long accustomed to "stagecraft in government," and the budget presented by the President should be kept in mind when the "Oscar" nominations are made later this year for the "Best Sound Effects." There were shifts in spending, moving from fiscal '65 to the present year, to make the President's new budget seem lower, such as the \$550 million in military purchases. There was "bubbly" optimism on the federal tax take next year, all based on a business upturn that may fall short of White House expectations, as in the past, and more than a quarter billion dollars anticipated in special federal fees was based on schemes that are by no means sure of Congressional approval. As some of the more experienced colleagues pointed out, too, "Don't forget the 'supplemental appropriation request' which still lies in President Johnson's bag of tricks which would permit him to come back to the Hill for more money." Nevertheless, this political sleight of hand was effective, it has apparently impressed the business community, and many wonder with amazement how President Johnson managed to whack a net of \$500 million off President Kennedy's last budget in an era of rising costs. Briefly, the cuts came in Defense (\$1.1 billion), Agriculture (\$1.2 billion), the VA (\$283 million), Post Office (\$71 million), AEC (\$65 million), Housing Agency (\$63 million), and State Department (\$3 million). Most other agencies and departments held even or increased their totals with the Space Agency jumping by a whopping \$590 million to nearly \$5 billion for the coming year. The biggest single item in the budget (\$52.3 billion this year), the defense establishment was the logical target for reductions. Because of a proposed cutback in nuclear weapons produc-

(more)

January 27, 1964

tion, plus huge spending of the past three years, Secretary McNamara was able to hand the President the \$51.2 billion level he sought.

President Johnson has observed the climate of America and knows election year pressure always makes economy a popular plank. The big cut came in Agriculture, but this was also true in fiscal '64 when the budget estimate was \$5.8 billion and actual expenditures were about \$7.3 billion. Just one case in point is the Food Stamp Plan now before our committee. He plugged for it in the State of the Union message, but it is necessary to point out it will cost \$100 million the first year if approved; so it should have been mentioned in his budget message. How can there be all the spending cuts and at the same time a massive attack on poverty and an "across-the-board" endorsement of every old--and many new--programs.

Let us not forget LBJ's budget, despite its fiscal magic, tops Eisenhower's last budget by some \$16.4 billion, and also that while his budget of \$97.9 billion purports to be \$500 million less than the current budget in terms of actual spending, it is expected to be \$5.4 billion more.

In his "economy" budget, President Johnson asks for \$103.7 billion in new obligational authority, \$5.4 billion more than the \$98.3 billion Congress approved for the current '64 budget year. Economists say it is the comparison of these figures which reveals the "moment of truth" in any federal budget. In addition to the \$98.3 billion already approved for this fiscal year, President Johnson has asked for \$4.2 billion in supplemental appropriations which can be spent any time, but are budgeted into the current year's spending in order to hold down the spending authority requests for next year.

While his budget message proclaims that 17,000 civilians are to be slashed from Defense Department employment, the same document also discloses another 15,800 will be added in non-defense jobs; hence the net cut of 1,200 is not really an overwhelming figure. A typical non-defense increase is the 4,730 employees to be added to the Department of HEW. When we consider the total federal employees anticipated by the '65 budget to be

(more)

January 27, 1964

- 6 -

2,511,200, there will be an actual increase of 21,000 more than worked for Uncle Sam in '63; but if non-defense employees alone are totaled, the increase between '63 and '65 is more than 48,000.

All in all, it would appear to me the big question is whether or not the taxpayers can stand Johnson's drive for economy. The only results thus far have been turning off the lights in the White House and the elimination of two limousines of a fleet of some ungodly number. This "magic" is popular, and the President well knows this, and he will continue to use every gimmick available between now and November to be re-elected. I only trust with the increasing number of international problems developing all over the world, he will not become so involved in domestic politics that our country's position as a world leader will be threatened. I don't know of many in politics who do not want to be re-elected, but I know of no one in politics, other than an incumbent President seeking re-election, who has the power to use or abuse his high office for unlimited political purposes.

STATISTICAL APPENDIX

Since the dawn of the twentieth century--64 years ago--Republican Administrations have occupied the White House for 34 years; Democrats 30. Yet Republicans have accomplished 22 balanced budgets; the Democrats only 3. Democrats have accounted for \$293 billion in cumulative budget deficits; Republicans barely \$14 billion. Republicans accept responsibility for 4.4 percent of our national debt; Democrats must shoulder the blame for 95.6 percent. Average unemployment under Republican Administrations is 5.6 percent; under Democrats, 8.5 percent. Average unemployment under President Eisenhower's Administration was 4.9 percent; unemployment in the three Democrat years since President Eisenhower left office has shot up to 6 percent. Republicans have reduced taxes eight times; Democrats only twice. Republicans have raised taxes only twice; Democrats have raised taxes 13 times.

Finally, When all the oratory is finished, three major wars have been fought under Democrat President; none under Republicans.

(more)

January 27, 1964

Democrat Records

"We are willing to submit the record to the people."

--Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson
New York Daily News
September 23, 1963

Record High Spending

Each day the Democrats have been in office since President Eisenhower left the White House they have spent \$50 million per day over and above what Ike spent.

Record Taxes

The Internal Revenue Service announced last October 31 that \$106 billion in taxes was collected in fiscal 1963. "This is the greatest amount ever collected by any country in history," the agency said.

Record High Cost of Living

The Labor Department reported last year the consumer price index had risen well above 107.1, based on the 1957-59 period, thus establishing the highest cost of living in history.

Other new records established by Democrats as 1964 opens:

record lowest value of the dollar (43¢ of the 1937-39 dollar)

record national debt limit (\$315 billion)

record agriculture-control borrowings (Commodity Credit Corporation borrowings stood at \$14.4 billion in 1963; legal limit is \$14.5 billion)

record highest peacetime budget (\$98.7 billion for fiscal 1964)

record decline in U. S. gold reserves (at slightly over \$15 billion, now stand at their lowest point since the 1930's)

record increase and number of civilian Government workers (over 2.5 million, highest ever in peacetime)

record alltime high welfare rolls (6.7 million Americans were on public welfare rolls in 1962, as reported April 3, 1963, by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Cost to all levels of government \$4.1 billion)

record increase and number of nonfarm home foreclosures (in 1963 stood at their highest point since the 1930's)

January 27, 1964

WHAT REPUBLICANS NEED

Now what WE need, my Republican friends, is not a bigger whopper than the Democrats have. What we Republicans need is what we have already--the truth. But we need to use it in exactly the same way as the Democrats have used their whopping big vote-getting prevarication. We need to tell the truth SIMPLY. We need to tell the truth over, and over, and over, AND OVER, again, and again, and AGAIN, until it gets so some of those Democrats who have begun to believe their own lies will become so angry at themselves that they will go out in the middle of a tornado and vote REPUBLICAN. We DON'T need to appeal to a human weakness, the way the Democrats do. But if I could think of a good human weakness to appeal to with the truth, don't think I wouldn't do it. I just can't think of one. We Republicans are on the RIGHT side, so I guess we're just stuck with appealing to the BETTER side of folks. This kind of appeal probably won't be as strong as the other kind, but we'll just have to make up for that with hard work.

Hard work--there's a point, a BIG point. But I'll get to that a little later. Even though I can't think of a way we can appeal to a human weakness, it would still be a mighty good idea if we could get people angry enough to vote Republican--now wouldn't it? Well, wouldn't it? The job ahead is going to take some enthusiasm, you know. All right. How can we use the truth that appeals to the better side of people to make them ANGRY? Angry enough to vote Republican. Let me answer this with a question. Do people like to be told lies? Do they like to be misled? What happens when you find out you have been lied to and misled? You get angry at the party who lied to you and misled you. That's what happens. And that is the answer. The way to make people angry enough to go out in the rain and vote Republican is to convince them of the truth that they are being lied to and misled by a certain party--the Democrat Party.

So, we are back to the truth again, aren't we? What is the truth and how can we state it simply?

WHO SPEAKS FOR LIBERTY?

I never cease to be impressed with the fact that our American patriots and our

(more)

founding fathers had one over-riding and prevailing concern...and that was the quest for liberty...not peace...but liberty!

These men in their divinely inspired wisdom knew that unless man was free, there could be no peace. They held the idea that all men were endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights..among which were life and liberty! They also believed that inasmuch as these rights were God-given they were not to be taken away by man...and that if government was to have any major responsibility to the governed...it was the protection of these rights and liberties. This was their concern and they proceeded to build within the framework of our government body a system of checks and balances designed to protect the citizen against the possibility of a government which might in time grow too centralized and too arbitrary in the use of its power...forgetting its prime responsibility as a protector of the life and liberty of the governed.

Recognizing the importance of liberty..and the thirst for liberty inherent in all men, the cause found many impassioned champions such as Patrick Henry and Tom Paine.

But who speaks for liberty today? Not a day goes by but what I read or hear of someone who is speaking of peace...but not so often of liberty. Where today do we find our Patrick Henrys, our Nathan Hales, our Benjamin Franklins, our George Washingtons, our Thomas Paines, our Paul Reveres or our Daniel Websters...all early leaders within whom the flames of freedom burned so brightly.

Well...thank God we do have Americans in growing numbers who are picking up the torch of liberty and holding it aloft so as to inspire others, and I firmly believe there are such people with us here tonight.

CONCLUSION

AMERICANISM

On December 9, 1963, J. Edgar Hoover stated in a speech, "We are at war with Communism and the sooner every red-blooded American realizes this, the safer we will be." Hoover, of course, has not been identified with any extremist group, so can safely speak

(more)

January 27, 1964

- 10 -

out against communism without being blasted by liberal editors, and we can be thankful he has the courage to do so.

RELAXATION OF TENSIONS

Recent events seem to make it clear any relaxation of tensions has come only from the U. S. For example, communist China has broken the truce and shelled Quemoy City in the Quemoy Islands--Castro has gone to Moscow by invitation of Premier Khrushchev--Zanzibar, one of the new "independent states" off the African East Coast has been converted into a pro-communist state--Ghana, in West Africa, another one of the ex-colonial states, has abolished the two-party system, and in effect is imitating the totalitarian system of the communists--troubles in Viet Nam (187 American dead), Malaysia and Indonesia have been intensified by communists. Don't forget the communist unity recently when Moscow and Peking denounced the U. S. as an aggressor in the Canal Zone and pledged full support to the Panamanians and that Castro is arranging for large shipments of machinery and other necessities from Western Europe. If this is "relaxation of tensions," Americans better remain "tensely unrelaxed."

PRESIDENTIAL POWER-PLAY

While President Johnson made great pronouncements concerning the "urgency" of passage of the Foreign Aid Bill, before the end of 1963, he didn't sign the measure until January 6, 1964. The "Christmas Eve Congressional Push" and the airlift of "absentee" Administration members to Washington demonstrated that "might, not right" prevailed.

End