

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN BOB DOLE (R-Kansas)
AT THE REPUBLICAN LINCOLN DAY DINNER
HALLECK CENTER, ST. JOSEPH'S COLLEGE
RENSSELAER, INDIANA, 6:00 P.M., FEB. 12, 1964

Coming here to Indiana at the invitation of my friend and Congressional leader, Congressman Charles Halleck, to speak in his home district is indeed an honor and a pleasure.

It was a little more than a century ago, right in the hey-day of Abraham Lincoln, that my home state of Kansas was first settled. Many of those settlers came from Indiana, so perhaps that is the reason why I feel so politically at home here with folks like you.

I am told by Congressman Halleck that in Indiana it is the universal heritage that the first words each child utters are, "I am not a candidate for office." Moreover, I have found out that no baby's birth certificate is valid unless it contains the baby's political faith and its precinct and ward.

You may be interested to know that my constituency is the First Congressional District of Kansas, and in its present form, is only about a year and a half old. My original Congressional district was the Sixth, but we were redistricted and the old Sixth was combined with the old Fifth to make all of western Kansas one Congressional District, the First.

It is 200 miles north and south from Nebraska to Oklahoma, and roughly 200 miles east and west from the center of the state to Colorado, comprising 58 counties and over half-a-million population. I am proud to say this is the largest wheat-growing area in the **world**.

When it comes to campaigning in the first district a candidate needs every travel means from dog teams to airplanes, plus about a dozen pairs of shoes and some seven-league boots.

The redistricting pitted me against a Democrat incumbent of four terms, a formidable opponent, in the Fall election of 1962. One of the foremost to help me and come personally to appear in my behalf was your own Congressman, my friend, Charles Halleck.

It was a victorious campaign by a truly substantial majority, and I attribute a great deal of that success to Charley Halleck's help and the upsurge of morale his early personal appearance gave my friends and me.

It is just such unsung efforts as this which contribute so much to the esteem and affection with which Charley's colleagues regard him.

Without being effusive and with no intent to make Charley blush, let me remind you, his home district friends, that no one in Congress, where he has served so ably for so many years, can compete with Charley Halleck in leadership, legislative skill, and devotion to the principles of the Republican Party. If constructive action is called for in behalf of a good program, regardless of partisanship, you will find Charley Halleck leading the fight. And, if the program is bad, or uncalled for, he will fight just as effectively against it.

One of the results of Charley Halleck's leadership is something often overlooked. It is just as important to keep bad legislation off the books as it is to pass good legislation. In view of the Republican minority position, with little opportunity to lead constructive programs directly, Charley Halleck and his Republican colleagues have saved this nation from countless programs and measures, ranging from bad to worse, especially in the areas of irresponsible spending and the quicksands of ever-mounting government controls.

It is truly a privilege and a matter of pride to me to be here as a guest of my distinguished Congressional leader, and to be visiting with a group such as yours.

Five score and ten years ago our forefathers conceived a great political party--a party dedicated not only to the proposition that all men are created equal but to the individual liberty and welfare of every citizen and to a united nation.

That party was and is the Republican Party--our party--whose first President was the immortal Abraham Lincoln. It is his birthday we honor tonight, not just as a date, but as a symbol of the ageless precepts he and the Republican Party stood for then and now.

One hundred years ago we were engaged in a great civil war to preserve the union and protect individual liberty. Today we are engaged in a world-wide conflict against Communism, again to preserve our nation and the free world, to insure liberty for the individual, and to maintain peace upon the earth.

Every American is dedicated to these purposes. Yet it is the patriotic duty of the Republican party to rouse the American people to the dangers of the methods and policies, or rather, lack of policy, by which the present Administration attempts these aims.

We must win this cold war against brutal Communist aggression, not lose it. And that is just what we are doing, losing it.. Any serious-thinking citizen can see our dangerous drift if he examines the globe and takes the trouble to penetrate the oceans of Administration propaganda designed to lull our people into false complacency that all is well, the goose hangs high, and they are doing a good job.

Reflect on the past twenty years and what has happened to the United States and the West from the aggression of the Soviet Union and

The big kick-off came at Yalta. At that historic conference President Roosevelt handed Stalin and the Soviets the countries ever since behind the Iron Curtain--East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Albania, Austria, and Yugoslavia. Eventually, Yugoslavia set-up its own brand of Communism, and under President Eisenhower and the Republicans we managed to get Austria into a better position of quasi-neutralization.

At the same conference President Roosevelt invited Russia into the Pacific War against Japan, opening up the next stage of Communist take-overs. They promptly took Manchuria and part of the Kurile Islands.

Then came President Truman and the fall of our friend and ally, China, to the Communists, truly a disaster -- remember the Truman Administration statesmen who maintained the Communists were only "agrarian reformers"?

Next came Korea and we fought a war of frustration, ending only in a divided country--a war of blood shed and suffering where the United States policy of allowing the enemy sanctuary behind the Yalu River inevitably brought stalemate.

In the next eight years under President Eisenhower and a Republican administration not one inch of territory was lost to Communism. John Foster Dulles was maligned for "brinkmanship", but his stalwart policy of strength and confrontation brought the Soviets, the Red Chinese and the spread of Communism to a dead halt.

But, in came the Kennedys and the New Frontier and for the past three years we have had the same old words from many of the same old mouths--friendly relations, the new Khrushchev, accommodation, trade with the Soviets, Red China in the United Nations, test ban treaty, disarmament,

and all the rest, which add up to ~~http://dolearchives.ku.edu/~~ -appeasement.

Out of this foreign policy, or lack of it, came first the catastrophe of the Bay of Pigs and a militant Communist Cuba. Despite the great, pre-1962 election confrontation, so-called, Cuba still is Communist spraying aggression all over the Western Hemisphere, militarily stronger than ever.

In the meantime we are fighting a losing war in Viet Nam, under the same policy of allowing sanctuary to the enemy just over the border. The Secretary of Defense reports on one day that we will win the war by 1965, but soon says we are losing the war, the following day says he means we were winning but with difficulties. Look for further statements tomorrow and
/ad infinitum.

We compelled Laos into neutralization which is Communist controlled. Cambodia has gone to Red China influence after \$300-millions of U.S. foreign aid. Zanzibar fell to the Red Chinese, and war and bloodshed have erupted all over east Africa.

Our flag is torn down and spat upon in Ghana and our embassy attacked. In Cypress our embassy is assaulted and Americans evacuated. Soviet East Germans shoot down an unarmed American plane and kill ^{three} American officers. Panama wants the Panama Canal, mobs rioted and with Cuban Communists giving directions and arms, attacked the U.S. Zone with resulting bloodshed.

France has recognized Red China, the British are selling buses to Cuba, Spain is about to do business with Castro, new Venezuelan Communist attacks on Americans and their property continue, Brazil is on the brink of chaos with Communist infiltration from Cuba.

What has President Johnson and his administration done about it?

They have protested to Britain and France, the O.A.S., and Ghana,

are talking to Panama, and offered U.S. Marines to get into the thick of the Cypress mess--a quarrel between two other countries and both our allies.

Under Administration urging we are selling wheat to Russia and President Johnson turned down the lights in the White House.

And while LBJ thus gave the country this magnificent spectacle of his prudence and thirft, Castro turned off the water at Guantanamo.

What a record! What a sorry, sorry record!

In the 1960 campaign you heard about the missile gap that wasn't; you heard about how low American prestige was abroad, that also wasn't.

Today, instead of a missile gap, your lives and mine are safe only to the extent of the vast missile, air, and military programs of President Eisenhower, which are now in effect. And, it would be well to check our missiles and be sure they will do the job, despite the angry denials of the Administration that anything could be wrong.

Today, the prestige of the United States is truly at an all-time low. "Yankee, Go Home" is the greeting an American citizen gets abroad.

What can we do about it?

I'll tell you what to do about it. Let's turn the light back on in the White House this November.

Let's turn on some Republican light by a Republican president.

Let's make that a blazing light with a Republican Congress.

Let's turn on that Republican light all over a dark and weary world and give it a new direction, a new strength and a new fortitude.

Let's abandon timidity, accommodation, appeasement and fear itself and demand and get respect from the nations of the world.

Let's convince the nations of the world, especially those who are emerging into independence, that we are not afraid of the Russians, and the Red Chinese, that we will stop our cowering to Cuba and our servility

Then, and only then, will we have their respect and the chance to earn their friendship.

Such a course will immediately bring out cries and opposition from that segment of the liberals and left-wingers whose extremists say "better Red than dead." Their more moderate fellows will cry "warmonger" and "you are in favor of a nuclear holocaust."

Nothing could be sillier or more false. The Republican Party is a party of peace. But the Republicans know that we must have overwhelming strength and the "guts" to confront our Communist enemies if we are ever to have peace.

We have only to look back at Munich, at Pearl Harbor, at Yalta, at Korea, at Cuba, to understand that Communist dedication to world domination and aggression has never stopped and never can be stopped except by the strength of America and her Allies and the courage to be resolute in the face of any danger or confrontation.

This is our only way to avoid war and keep the world at peace. And to my mind, it is the Republican Party's way.

Here at home we have passed a tax cut and everyone I have ever known is heartily in favor of cutting taxes. We should cut taxes more and make a real tax-saving to our long burdened citizens--but with a provision, and a most important provision.

That is, we must cut spending in a proper proportion to cutting taxes.

If the budget presented by President Johnson is a sample of this Administration's pledge to reduce spending, then we had better all tighten our seat belts. The tricky bookkeeping, the juggling of expenditures

from one fiscal year to the next. The unrealistic "guesstimates" of this budget, all made up a masterpiece of financial hoodwinking. It was designed to get headlines to show a sudden shift to economy by an administration pledged to the New Frontier program of the greatest spending in history.

Now that we have a tax cut, we in the Congress, and you, our constituents must be alert to hold the Administration to its promised economy. If they go on spending and we go deeper and deeper into debt and deficits, inflation could set in at any moment which would wipe out all the benefits of the tax cut and much more to every citizen of our land.

It seems to me that a look at the financial record of the past three years under Democrat rule might well be in order. From the last day of the Republican Administration under President Eisenhower here is the New Frontier record as published in the Feb. 7, 1964, issue of the Republican Congressional Newsletter:

"Federal Spending -- Up \$16-billion annually.

"National Debt-- Up \$19.1 billion.

"Unemployment -- Up from 3.9 million to 4.2 million.

"Bankruptcies -- Up 50 per cent since the last Eisenhower year, from 100,000 to more than 155,000.

"Mortgage Foreclosures -- Nearly doubled over 1960's 37,128.

"Total Farm Debt -- Up \$3 billion.

"Cost of Living -- Up from 103.1 per cent to an all-time high of 107.6 per cent and still climbing.

"Federal Employment -- Up 131,116.

" The three-year record of this Democratic Administration, in short, paints a picture of 'how to get America moving'--backwards."

Yours is an agricultural as well as industrial state. So perhaps

you will be interested in the farm program proposed by the President
This document is from the collections at the Dole Archives, University of Kansas
<http://dolearchives.ku.edu>
this past week.

In brief, this Administration's farm program has not changed its stripes from previous attempts to put agriculture under government control and management. The program for cotton and dairy products is a "Brannan Plan" offering payments not to produce under greater controls.

As a member of the Wheat Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee I have been in the midst of their proposed wheat program. The bill was passed out of Subcommittee "without recommendation."

Last week I called a meeting attended by 25 midwest Republican House members who are now working for a bi-partisan wheat bill which will stop the downward slide of farm income and still protect the wheat farmer from absolute government control. We hope we can get cooperation from our Democrat colleagues.

The farm program presented by the Administration brings into focus the real difference between the Democrat and Republican parties and what they stand for domestically.

Every year Democrat rule sees more government control in more and more segments of our economy and life. Business, industry, labor, agriculture, the professions, education, transportation, highways -- you name it, they'll take it under the wing of government control just as fast and far as they can. Once under government management, regulation and control the United States will have forsaken its great destiny and fallen into the role of statism, paternalism, socialism, or even quasi-communism. Then is when our pocket books, our livelihood, our liberty will not only be forfeited but someone in government who of course knows all things better than the individual citizen will direct our lives.

Just as Abraham Lincoln stood four-square for the Republican

This document is from the collections at the Dole Archives, University of Kansas.
<http://dolearchives.ku.edu>

principles of private enterprise for the individual liberty and welfare of every citizen, for the preservation of our national unity and for the destiny of American leadership throughout the world, so does the Republican Party of 1964.

As we look ahead to the coming election this November, it is well in the months to come to watch the political party or administration or person who is "all things to all people."

As we watch the new administration each day offering greater and greater public benefits to this group and that class, to this sex and that gender, to the rich and the poor, to the needy and the affluent, to the young and the old, to all men, all things, let us remember what Abraham Lincoln so rightly cautioned: "You can fool all the people some of the time; you can fool some of the people all the time; but you can't fool all the people all the time."

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN BOB DOLE (R-KANSAS)
REPUBLICAN LINCOLN DAY DINNER
(HALLECK CENTER, ST. JOSEPH'S COLLEGE)
RENSSELAER, INDIANA, FEB. 12, 1964

Coming to Indiana to speak in the district of Congressman Halleck is indeed an honor.

Congressman Halleck has many times stated that in Indiana the first words a child utters are, "I am not a candidate for office." Well, this is also true in Kansas but there a baby's birth certificate is not valid unless it contains the baby's political affiliation.

As stated, the First Congressional District of Kansas resulted from redistricting. It is 200 miles north and south from Nebraska to Oklahoma, and roughly 200 miles east and west from the center of the state to Colorado, comprising 58 counties and 550,000 people and is the largest wheat-growing district in America.

The redistricting pitted me against a "me too" Democrat incumbent of three terms in the Fall election of 1962, and I'm proud to say one of the first to appear in Kansas in my behalf was your friend and mine, Charlie Halleck.

We won by a truly substantial majority and a great deal of that success can be attributed to Charlie's help and the fact issues were clearly drawn.

No one in Congress can compete with Charlie Halleck in leadership, legislative skill, and devotion to the principles of the Republican Party. If constructive action is called for, you know better than I Charlie will lead the fight and be behind it. If the program is bad, he will oppose it from start to finish.

In view of the Republican minority position, and little opp-

ortunity to initiate constructive programs, Charlie and our Republican colleagues have saved this nation from countless ridiculous programs in the areas of irresponsible spending and the quicksands of ever-mounting government controls.

A 100 years ago we were engaged in a great Civil War to preserve the Union and protect individual liberty. Today, whether we like it or not, we are engaged in a world-wide conflict against Communism.

Under President Eisenhower and a Republican administration not one inch of territory was lost to Communism and while John Foster Dulles was maligned for "brinkmanship", his stalwart policy of strength and confrontation brought the Soviets, the Red Chinese and the spread of Communism to a dead halt.

With the New Frontier we have the same old words, the "new" Khrushchev, accommodation, trade with the Soviets, Red China in the United Nations, Test Ban Treaty, Disarmament, and all the rest, which add up to appeasement, coexistence, and peace at any price.

First came the catastrophe of the Bay of Pigs and despite the great, pre-1962 election confrontation, Cuba is still Communist spraying aggression over the Western Hemisphere and unfortunately, militarily stronger than ever.

We are fighting a losing war in Viet Nam, under the same policy of allowing sanctuary to the enemy just over the border. The Secretary of Defense reports on one day we will win by 1965, but almost the next we are losing, and on the following day says he means we were winning but with difficulties.

We forced Laos into neutralization which is Communist controlled. Cambodia has gone to Red China influence after \$300-million of U.S. foreign aid. Zanzibar fell to the Red Chinese, and war and bloodshed have

Our flag is torn down and spat upon in Ghana and our embassy attacked, In Cyprus our embassy is assaulted and Americans evacuated. Soviet East Germans shoot down an unarmed American plane and kill three American officers. Panama wants the Panama Canal, mobs rioted and with Cuban Communists giving directions and arms, attacked the U.S. Zone with resulting bloodshed.

France has recognized Red China, the British are selling buses to Cuba, Spain is about to do business with Castro, Venezuelan Communist attacks on Americans and their property continue and Brazil is on the brink of chaos with Communist infiltration.

What has President Johnson and his administration done about it? Well, frankly, it appears there has been a "moratorium" on foreign policy. There has been a mild protest to Britain, and France, the O.A.S., and Ghana. We are "discussing" with Panama, and offered U.S. Marines in the Cyprus mess-a quarrel between two other countries and both our allies.

Under Administration urging we are selling wheat to Russia, and our willingness in this area has literally opened the "flood gates" around the world,

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.

(1.) Present Russian obligation from WW I--with interest, total over \$620 million. (2.) So-called pipeline lend-lease in WW 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 WW 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 U.N. 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 appropriations this year exceeded \$51 billion--all, we are told, to protect us from communism. Some 14,000 Americans are now in Viet fighting communism and over 175 Americans have made the supreme sacrifice and over 500 have been wounded.

I would assume your bankers are about the same as Kansas bankers, and if any one of us had a credit rating like the one just recited, I would imagine what any banker might say if we applied for a loan, but even more important is the fact that we must assume much of the responsibility for the present attitude of France and Great Britain.

The moment President Johnson succeeded in his Congressional power-play and sales of wheat and other commodities to Communist countries was approved by the Democrats in Congress the lid was off in Europe. We cannot offset this blunder by denouncing those who now trade with Communist Cuba if we think for a moment that Russia is pumping over \$1-million a day into the Cuban economy. I trust most Americans will

realize our sale of wheat to <http://dolearchives.ku.edu> will enhance the stature of Castro as well as pump up Khrushchev's sagging economy.

It seems to me that it is high time Johnson calls for western solidarity and indicates his good faith by halting all transactions with Russia respecting the sale of wheat or other agricultural commodities. It was just last December 9 that J. Edgar Hoover stated: "We are at war with Communism and the sooner every red-blooded American realizes this, the safer we will be," and I think it is of paramount importance that this Administration quits talking of unilateral relaxation of tensions and begins an inventory of just who are our friends and enemies in the world. When we do not stand up for our own rights we are not entitled to respect from other nations and when this great country cannot even stand up to the likes of Panama and Cuba, you--the people--have every right to be concerned and I mean concerned with the future security of our country and not anyone's reelection.

As we honor Abraham Lincoln this week, it is appropriate, I think, to recall his words of more than 100 years ago. For today--in the stormy present--our relations with nations overseas are falling apart. It is imperative that we try a different approach--that we "think anew and act anew."

While wanting to be liked, to be popular around the world, perhaps we have been too idealistic in our dealings with other nations. We have seen our kindness and generosity taken advantage of. We have been repaid with sneers and ill will and ingratitude.

If any man knew what it was to be maligned and sneered at and hated in his lifetime, it was Lincoln. If any man was an idealist, it was Lincoln. I am sure he must have been bitterly heartsick at some of the decisions he was forced to make. But when they became inevitable, he

Today, it is inevitable that we search for--and find--a workable foreign policy for this nation. We must face up to what is happening. We must not shrink from whatever decisions are necessary.

WHAT'S AHEAD IN '64?

The Nation's Capital 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 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 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

This document is from the collections at the Dole Archives, University of Kansas
<http://dolearchives.ku.edu>

budget (\$52.3-billion this year) the defense establishment was the logical target for reductions. Because of a proposed cutback in nuclear weapons production, 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 knows the climate of America and that in an election year economy is always 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 recently tabled by the House Agriculture Committee. Lyndon 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 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

Page 17 of 21

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 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.

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 Presidents; none under Republicans.

"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 all-time high welfare rolls (6.7-million Americans were on public welfare rolls in 1962, as reported April 3, 1963, by the Dept. of H.E.W. 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)

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 poverty or other human weaknesses, as the Democrats do. It would be a good idea if people get angry enough to vote Republican. We can and should use the truth that appeal to the better side of people to make them angry? 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/and you have a right to. That's what happens, and that is the answer--just convince people of the truth.

Who Speaks for Liberty?

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